

plane of half-personified forces of nature together with a pantheon of Gods and Goddesses who were to be propitiated by hymns and sacrifices. The prayers that were offered unto various Gods were intended mainly for worldly things, riches, children and the like. Life in that age was simple, fresh and full of hopes and expectations and consequently the people of the Vedic age used to take pleasure in life and work. They were not at all gloomy or pessimistic. Life was a good thing to them and they were out in the world to enjoy life to its full brim. All sights and sounds of nature used to create a mysterious atmosphere for them and in this environment they used to breathe a freshness of life which inspired them to offer prayers in solicitation and admiration of various Nature Gods. In the beginning, they were more interested in the visible aspects of Nature which used to influence directly their limited pleasures and pains. So, they had a very strong desire for winning the good grace of the presiding gods of these natural phenomena and the result was an objective approach to the realm of superior values.

Centre for the Arts

Although this objective outlook of the Vedic thinker could not discover the underlying unity between the cosmic principle and the individual self, still it succeeded in giving expression to an intense urge for greatness and nobility of human life which had really emerged from the depths of the evolving ideals of human perfection and human glory.

The characteristic that distinguishes man from beast is his capacity to discriminate between good and evil. It is this ethical sense and spiritual discrimination that constitutes the highest prerogative of man as the glory of humanity lies mainly in the fullest manifestation of his inner excellences (both moral and spiritual).

Man's endeavour to achieve this inner moral and spiritual growth is actually his *sādhana* for the attainment of the ideal of humanity and such strivings and endeavours were clearly visible among the people of the Vedic age. Since the higher

God-heads were believed to be the superior powers exercising living influences on the social life of the Vedic people, the sages who were the leaders of the society had tried to disclose through their prayers not only the way of pleasing the deities but also the truth that these gods should be regarded as the manifestation of a Supreme Spirit behind and above, controlling and moving all objects and phenomena. The supreme purpose of life, therefore, ought to be to grow into higher varieties of spiritual existence. Indeed, it was the journey of the Vedic seers up the hill of their true being that had found finest expression in and through these hymns and prayers. When the Vedic sage uttered :

Rco A Kṣare paramē vyoman
Yasmin devā adbhivīṣve niṣeduh
Yastanna vedo kimṛcā kariṣyati
ya ittadviduramṛtāste bhavanti
(Rgveda)

he was not making an attempt to please the supreme God or gods (who were supposed to be His various manifestations) for personal pleasures only : on the other hand, he was declaring that one should seek to know the supreme God without whose knowledge R̥K mantras would be of no use to him. To see Truth and to know Truth is the privilege of man and not of beast. Hence to attain the greatness of manhood, one should seek to enrich mind with the knowledge of the highest and the best ; because the spiritual progress is the only thing that can make him immortal. So, it can be safely suggested that the concept of manhood as the realisation of the socio-moral excellences of human life was present in a positive form even in the dim past of the Vedic age.

In fact, it is the very idea that the socio-moral good is closely connected with the spiritual good in the form of true knowledge of the Supreme Being, that has found a fine expression in the acceptance of R̥ta both as a cosmic law and a moral law in the R̥gvedic age. Virtue and righteousness

ought to be practised by human beings as no group life or social life is possible without it. Transgressors of socio-moral rules are sinners as they work for the degradation of both human life and the life of the society. That is why, in the *yajurveda*, we find the sages offering their heartfelt prayers unto the Supreme Being in these words :

“May the creator, the fountain of happiness and knowledge inspire us for the performance of the noblest deeds with our organs..... May a thief and a sinner be never born amongst us.”

—*Yajurveda—Chapter 1 No. 1*
(English translation by Devi Chand)

Human aspiration to rise to the highest level of existence by getting rid of all the impurities of his soul through divine grace has repeatedly found expression through innumerable passages of the *Yajurveda* some of which are cited below :

Indira Gandhi National
Centre for the Arts

Chapter 1 : No. 3 : “May He purify us through the store of true knowledge and all sciences contained in the Vedas elevating selfless deeds.”

Chapter 1 : No. 6 : “Who prompts you to do good deeds ? It is He the Great Lord who guides us on the path of virtue. Why does He do so ? For the performance of noble virtuous deeds and fulfilment of the vow of leading a truthful life.”

(English translation by Devi Chand)

What actually should be the connotation of nobility or virtue was of course not very analytically and scientifically considered in that age : yet the very fact, that even in that far

off age the normal and spiritual excellences of the human soul were alone regarded as the elixir of humanity, cannot be denied. It was the sincere belief of the vedic age that in order to attain the greatness of human life and purity of human existence, one ought to pay due respect to the law of righteousness which was upheld by God himself.

Even the ritualistic sacrifices were performed not for gaining purely personal benefits, but for enhancing the social good as well. There are many passages in the *yajurveda* proving conclusively that the development of the feeling of sociality was an important trait of perfect human character, Socio-ethical virtues were, in their opinion, very intimately related to spiritual perfection. Some such passages are quoted below :

Chapter I : No. 9 : "O ye men, increase the store of goods acquired by honest and fair means to be used in the service of humanity. May your life be constantly dedicated to this principle. May the spiritually-minded people also not give up this humanitarian work."

Chapter 1 : No. 11 : "I resort to agriculture and craft for removing poverty and ministering happiness to all."

Chapter 1 : No. 13 : "We should all perform agreeable *yajñas* for the attainment of God, for noble acts for the acquisition of fine virtues and for temporal and spiritual advancement. "With the aid of *yajñas* purify all substances and human beings. *Yajñas* will remove all your physical and other defects."

(English translation by Devi Chand)

These passages clearly prove that the sacrifices were not mere mechanical performances of the rituals of the Vedic religion. On the contrary, these were of great social, psychological and ethical values. Even when the sacrifice was accorded the supreme position, it was described as the producer of rain and the giver of spiritual knowledge, both of which were necessary for the good of the whole society. The only thing that was not clearly expounded by the seers of this age was the total merging of the perfected human soul in God in the trans-empirical state of existence. The vedic thought and discipline was otherwise primarily ethical as the moral law was admitted by the vedic sages as the law of life given by God to human beings. Hence, it can be safely suggested that one should pay due respect to the religious teachings of the Vedas as well, if one wishes to trace the origin of ethical concepts of Indian philosophy from the historical point of view.

Humanity in the Period of Upaniṣads

Coming to the age of Upaniṣads (700 B. C. to 600 B. C.) we find that the greatest contribution of this period to Indian culture is the declaration of the identity between Brahman and Ātman. The soul or the principle consciousness manifesting itself very prominently through living beings of the world is the ultimate reality and by nature it is pure and non-attached to worldly things. Due to beginningless ignorance, it forgets its own nature and gets entangled in the vortex of worldly life. Therefore, the sole purpose of the soul is to gain back its purity by removing all the impurities through ethical culture. According to the upaniṣadic thinkers, the normal excellences alone constitute the perfect personality of man and so these are very intimately connected with the spiritual realisation of an individual self. In fact, according to the Upaniṣads, there can be no true spiritualism unless it is based upon the sure foundation of morality. The perfection of manhood is synonymous with moral acquisition and the perfection of morality culminates naturally

in spiritual realisation. It is because of this fact that the Upaniṣads have recognised clear-cut distinctions between the path of the worldly pleasures and the path of the good. The path of the good is that of morality flowering automatically into spiritual enlightenment and self-realisation. The path of the worldly pleasure leads to the fulfilment of worldly desires relating to the body only and does not render any help to a man in his self-realisation. The upaniṣadic ideal, therefore, is the moral regeneration of man accomplished through the practice of humanity – a regeneration which is the only instrument that can help him to rise above the temptation of this worldly life and enjoy the eternal bliss of his true being.

The human glory includes culture of certain socio-ethical virtues such as self-control, charity with sympathy, compassion, truthfulness, love, forgiveness, humility etc. Personal purity and nobleness of heart are to be valued by man because these are the guiding stars that lead him to final goal. Indeed, these are the qualities that have been given a very important place in the upaniṣads.

Humanity and the Common and Relative Duties of the Smṛtis, Epics and the sūtras (200 B. C. to 300 A. D.)

The varṇavibhāga or class distinction made its first appearance in the age of the Ṛg veda. It was, however, pushed back to a certain extent in the age of the upaniṣads. During the period of the smṛtis and the sūtras this system received a new orientation and through this social scheme an attempt was made to reconcile between the socio-ethical good and the spiritual good of self realisation. The main object of the division was to regard the inner self of man as the highest reality and also to realise the vastness and divinity of this self in and through socio-moral institutions. The individual was regarded merely as a functioning component of the social organisation. The main motive of each individual soul was to realise the vastness and magnanimity of the spirit

by completely identifying himself with his own social group. Personal tendencies were not to be cultivated and self-assertive individuality not to be developed as all these constituted an obstacle to self-realisation which could be attained only by total effacement of the ego-sense of a person. One had to look upon oneself not as an individual A, B, or C, but always as a member of his group. Expansion of spiritual personality was the ultimate end of Indian life and the class division was the social scheme by which the interests of the individual life were wholly subordinated to the interests of society. The message of the upaniṣads that the individual souls were nothing but the sparks of One Great Soul which formed the transcendental background of this worldly life had been made the foundational principle of this social classification: consequently, the social division was not based on the base sentiments of hatred and malice, but on the noble humanitarian feeling of love and unity. In fact, Varna-Vibhāga which was nothing but a social plan of this smṛti period might be regarded as an outcome of a more developed concept of humanity. By this system individuals of various capacities could get equal opportunities to show their inherent powers in every sphere of life. This was indeed a harmony of multicoloured personalities in a social unit.

The basic principle of Indian culture is to feel intensely and to realise fully that mankind has a common heritage and a common spring of life. Humanity consists in the full development of the vision of oneness based on the finer sentiments of love, friendship and spiritual freedom. By introducing the scheme of social division the thinkers of the smṛti age gave a definite proof that Indian culture was not indifferent to social stability and social well-being. On the other hand, Varna-Vibhāga gave a positive outlook on social life which sought to prove that self-realisation pre-supposed a developed sense of the feelings of social unity without which the progressive realisation of the virtues and excellences of human heart was not possible. Thus, in the post-upaniṣadic period,

we find that a strong sense of positive well being of people grew side by side with a traditional ideal of liberation. Humanity, therefore, seems to mean the total renunciation of the ego-centric desires of a man in favour of higher interests of the society. It also means the cultivation of the habit of expanding one's own soul through the constant practice of socio-moral virtues. Neither happiness nor wealth should be sought for by transgressing socio-moral laws.

“Parityajet arthakamau

*

yau syatam dharmavarjitau”

was the lesson imparted to the general mass by Manu, the great law-maker of India. Manu has emphasised that it is the sacred duty of a man to adhere to all virtues belonging to his particular caste. The Rājadharmā section of the Mahābhārata, too, lays great emphasis on the observance of the moral principles which constitute the very basis of higher type of society. Not only Varna-Dharmas but also Sādhārana Dharmas should be practised vigorously since the former will be conducive to the emergence of the feeling of identity with one's own social group, whereas the cultivation of the latter will help a man to understand and realise his oneness with the whole of humanity. The very fact that the feeling of identity requires the development of an introspective attitude of mind has often been mentioned as an evidence of the fact that Indian culture does not pay heed to social aspects of human life and teaches only to look within one's own self with a view to finding out his true nature. If we reflect on this point carefully, we shall be able to grasp the great efficacy of this method. It is because we are not used to the practice of self-analysis that we fail to realise the defects and imperfections of our own mind and easily lay blame on others. The result is constant conflict and strife between man and man, society and society, nation and nation. If we are

*Dharma—Moral Law or ten human excellences recognized by Manu.

true to ourselves we must first of all make a sincere attempt to purge our mind of all its animal legacy in the forms of anger, malice etc. This is never possible unless one looks within and finds out the cankers that hinder the unfoldment of his humanitarian qualities. Hence, introspective attitude has got to be developed if one wishes to render valuable services to society. Indeed, it is the firmly-rooted belief in India that regular practice of the moral duties in the worldly life is the thing that can promote equitable adjustment of relative demands of smaller societies in a higher ethical life of humanity.

In India, moral life has been viewed as antagonistic to natural life. According to this view, moral life involves constant struggle with the grosser aspect of a man's life which is controlled by six passions, namely, lust, anger, greed, pride, infatuation and envy. These baser feelings are required to be uprooted by constant practice of socio-moral virtues. But it may be asked how these virtues are to be cultivated. Herein comes the Gītā with its ideal of *niṣkānma karma* i.e. performance of duty from a sense of duty and divine service. According to the Gītā, every human being has his own duties to perform which he cannot neglect. Not only this, he has also to remain fully alive to the demands of his domestic, social and moral life. How to perform these duties religiously has been clearly stated in the Gītā. The Gītā advises a man that he should do his duty without any hope of reward or fear of punishment. To do good through fear only is a sign of animality : to do good from a sense of duty and service is humanity. All actions should be performed from a sacred sense of duty and not from any egoistic motive of gain, arrogance, hatred and pride. Even when the King punishes a wrong-doer, he should do it without hatred or malice. The effects of any action can bind the doer only when in doing that action, he has a selfish motive to realise. But if he does not seek anything for himself and performs all his actions disinterestedly, his work will not affect him in

any way. A man should, therefore, give up all his desires for selfish motives and dedicate all his actions to the Supreme Being : because then and then only he will be able to develop all human excellences in finest forms. This spirit of detachment, kept alive in the performance of daily duties in different walks of life, will help a man to reach the apex of human glory which in its turn will lead him automatically to the Highest Goal.

The attitude of *vairāgya* implying total renunciation of the ego-centric desires has also been described as the spirit of *aparigraha*. This virtue of *aparigraha* has been regarded as the basic principle of Indian ideal of humanity and spiritual culture. One who develops this noble tendency, gives up fully the spirit of selfishness with the result that he does not feel any difficulty either in giving every man what is his due or in administering justice to all in a spirit of love and service. Indeed, it is the desire for selfish gain that acts as a violent force of social disintegration and prevents men from living the life of noble and peaceful co-existence. If mankind as a whole is not in favour of giving up the sense of ego-hood and narrow individuality, then despite best efforts, human beings will not be able to reach the true ideal of humanity. That a purification of heart by the fire of knowledge of the oneness of mankind is the only means for the attainment of an integration of mankind has been repeatedly declared by the Indian preachers of humanity from the hoary vedic age upto the present age of science and scientific progress. An individual should make a sincere attempt to become a man in the true sense of the term by removing animal passions from his heart which are constantly trying to drag him down to the level of animal existence, full of strifes and struggles. In this pursuit the *Gitā* is a great help to the individual if he sticks to its ideal of disinterested action and courts an active life in a spirit of *vairāgya* and *aparigraha*. This attitude of detachment in active life is the only means by which a man can fight and conquer a purely natural life and fulfil his life's

mission. The spiritual culture of India teaches a man to awaken in him the spirit of humanity which enables him to ascend to a still higher stage of Divinity.

Conclusion

In fine, it can be reasonably asserted that from the very dawn of civilisation Indian people have felt and expressed a sincere desire to imbibe all excellent qualities of man. India is the only land where great importance has been attached to the purification of mind rather than to material prosperity and individual happiness. The search for truth in India primarily means a search for the moral and spiritual values of life. Such emotional feelings for higher values spring forth spontaneously from the innermost core of one's heart and flow out with such a force that it reshapes an individual in a newer and nobler form. Indian culture has never disregarded the ideal of humanity in favour of the higher transcendental ideal of self-realisation. On the other hand, it has taught the greatest truth that the ideal of self-realisation cannot be achieved unless there is socio-moral advancement. Life has to be lived by each one of us for a harmonious development of our character towards the moral ideal. And this ought to be the sense in which Indian culture should be described as spiritual. According to Indian view, moral development should be an inner growth and should spring from life and faith. In the moral sphere, a man should not move on like machine without being conscious of his moral duties and respond with animal impulses to the happenings of life without reflecting on them. He should be alert and should create himself anew in accordance with the scriptural instructions laid down for the elimination of the passions of mind. The cardinal virtues of love, sympathy, friendship and indifference should be practised by all with the force of conviction that these alone constitute the elixir of humanity. In ancient India, moral training and education through personal contact with the teacher was supposed to be the best means for self-development and self-culture as this alone

could provide a student with the opportunity of chastening his own heart and character by following the living ideal of the saintly life of his teacher. Education and not law was always accepted as the most suitable means for the building up of pure personalities and noble leaders of humanity. It was only when education had failed to keep a person on the path of duty that Indians had taken recourse to punishment and legal help. Education is indeed the training which by its own inherent force stirs up the will and sets it to fashion the individual in a finer form by awakening faith in his own self and also by making him stand on his own feet. All sense of personal advancement and the craving for egoistic satisfaction cease permanently through true education. Indeed civilisation can flourish when a world based on the humanitarian sentiments of goodwill, love and active sympathy, self-restraint and strong sense of duty comes into being. With the emergence of such a world, it is possible to preach the message of oneness of all life—a message that is bound to bring together the entire humanity after cementing the bridges of narrowness which unfortunately separate man from man.

VIVEKANANDA ON GOD

Swami Vivekananda was an advocate of *advaita-vedānta* ; he was also a devoted disciple of Shri Ramakrishna who was a worshipper of Mother Kālī. Although the philosophy of Vivekananda is essentially non-dualistic he has pleaded for devotion and divine worship by describing the Impersonal Supreme reality as God. The series of lectures on *Bhakti*, which Swamiji has delivered from time to time, shows that he never thought ill of any cult based on the fundamental duality between God and the individual soul. Like Śankara he, too, was of the opinion that all forms of divine worship could be harmonised with *advaita-vedānta* without doing any harm to its non-dualistic spirit.

Love is God

In all his lectures, Vivekananda has described God as "love" and also as the Great attractive power that lies at the very root of this universe. Love, again, has been described by him as *Sadhana* (Krishna is God and Radha is mad with love for Him). That is to say that in his opinion, God is Love and can be realised through Love. Ordinarily, these statements of Swamiji raise certain questions in our critical minds. Is Love one with the great attractive force which is governing this world of ours ? Or is it the nectar that is constantly flowing down currents from the bosom of that Great power ? Who is the Great one that possesses this power ? How can love be both the end and the means for gaining the end ? One may ask : are not these statements of Swamiji regarding the nature of God confusing and contradictory ?

Now, if we go deep into the spirit of his theistic comments, we find that these contradictions are only apparent and not real. All these statements can be knitted together in a logical manner to build up the theistic philosophy of Swami Vivekananda. Swamiji realised the necessity of harmonising the

warm yearnings of the human heart with the cold criticisms of Reason. So he has not only advocated the existence of *saccidananda* as the ultimate category, but has also described the Supreme being as Love. It is only when God is regarded as Love that man can find full satisfaction of his emotional nature by seeking shelter in Him. Love is what a human heart always craves for. If love does not find any place in a religious system then that system ceases to be religious in the true sense of the term. In the Gita, Lord Krishna says that he is the knowledge of the knowers. (*Jñānam jñānavatamaham*) Swamiji says that God is the very love of the lovers. Love is the noblest and finest flowering of the emotional life of a person and as such it is to be regarded as the manifestation of the immortal juice in the very being of a finite personality. Just as God is both knowledge and attainable through knowledge, in the same manner He is both Love and attainable through Love.

Love as Means

It is because God is Love and is present in all beings and things of the world as their essence and excellence that love also serves as the principal means for attaining communion with God. Love in the form of Divinity constitutes the innermost core of an individual soul. In the words of Katha Upaniṣad, it is "*Guḍamanupraviṣṭam*". Though it is present in the soul, yet due to ignorance and impurities of this worldly life, this divinity remains concealed and unrealised. The form in which Love ordinarily finds expression in worldly life is tainted and made narrow by the soiling touch of egoism and selfish individuality. The result is that we cannot love anybody disinterestedly (i. e. for love's sake only). Hence, love in worldly life appears in the forms of selfishness, lust, greed etc. and prevents us from attaining the highest ideal of life. (Even this selfishness is but a manifestation of the same love). If Love is to be purified, then constant practice of virtues in the forms of charity with sympathy, compassion, forgiveness, humility, love etc. becomes absolutely necessary

for a devoted soul. All these virtues are nothing but expressions of Love in different forms. Hence, to practise these virtues in all types of social relation is equivalent to adopting love as a means to God-realization. Purity and nobleness of heart are to be valued by man because these are the guiding stars to lead him to his final goal: such purity cannot be attained unless the heart of man is flooded with Love by constant culture of it in a disinterested manner in all walks of his worldly life. The conception of God as Love can remain fixed in the mind of the devotee only through its ceaseless display in all worldly affairs. The whole of the world constitutes a single family of which God is the Father. So, all members should be connected together by the ties of friendship and love. It is only by loving the finite in a disinterested manner (considering it as a manifestation of God) that the *mumuksu* can become mad with love and longing for God. It would, therefore appear that there is no contradiction if one says that God is Love and is also attainable through love. It is the nature of love to change a man into that which he loves. If a man loves the Great Love, he himself changes into that form and becomes one with the Life Divine. In fact, the love that we display in our day-to-day dealings is nothing but an expression of that Great Love which remains covered by the dust of impurities issuing forth from various *antaḥkaraṇikā* *vṛttis*.

*God is both Love and the Great Attractive
Power of the Universe*

There is also no inconsistency in describing God both as Love and as the great attractive power of the Universe. If God as Love is the cause of the whole universe, then it is only logical that He should also be regarded as the great attractive power of the world. That which is Love, naturally draws everything towards it. Moreover, *jagatkāraṇatā* itself is power or 'Śakti' and hence God as Love and as the root cause of the universe is bound to be an attractive power behind and beyond

this world of created existence. He is the force which regulates the course of the sun and the moon. He is the reality that constitutes the very being of all created things of the universe and it is He who is expressing Himself in the world in the forms of various natural laws. "Unattached yet shining in every thing is love, the motive power of the universe without which the universe would fall to pieces in a moment, and this love is God." The Highest Being is described in the Bṛhad Upaniṣad as fearless (*abhayaṃ vai janaka prāptosi*). It is only Love that is fearless and any body who tastes love becomes fearless. The mother does not hesitate to stand face to face with death when she realises that by doing so she can save the life of her dear son. A devoted wife is not afraid of risking her own precious life for the sake of her beloved husband. The Ultimate Reality as described in the Upaniṣad is *abhiḥ* and Love too is *abhiḥ*. We find that Swamiji has not said anything against Vedānta teachings by describing the Highest Being as Love. Since this Great Love is the source of everything it is also the source of all forms of finite love which we enjoy in and through our worldly relations. Infinite love produces finite love just as Infinite knowledge produces finite phenomenal knowledge. Hence, God is both Love and a fountain of Love from which streams of sympathy, affection, compassion etc. are flowing downwards to feed the hearts of human beings. There is no vagueness in describing God both as Love and as the possessor of Love as the *advaita-vedānta* recognises *tādātmya* and not *bheda* between power and the possessor of power.

Considering from all points of view, we can say the statements of Vivekananda regarding the nature of God signify only the truth that God is Love.

In *Pañcadaśī*, God has been described as *ānandamaya* and it has been stated that being bliss, God is also the object of love (*Yah paramānandarupo na bhavati sa niratiśaya pre-maviṣaya na bhavati*). In fact the two statements "God is bliss" and "God is love" convey the same truth. Although,

ordinarily we think that love issues forth from *Ananda* as an effect, still from the philosophical point of view, these two terms can be used to signify the same truth. It is *Ananda* that finds expression in and through love. Bliss, indeed, is the inner aspect and Love is the outer expression of the Supreme being. God dwells in the heart of man as bliss and when this bliss is expressed in the external world, it assumes the form of love and devotion. Hence, there is no cause-effect relationship between bliss and love.

God as Love and Practical Advaita

This conception of God as Love is the keynote of Swami Vivekananda's practical *advaita*. Although Swamiji is a staunch follower of *advaita-vedānta*, still the view of the *advaitins* that knowledge and action cannot meet together has not found favour with him. On the other hand, Swamiji has taught us that action understood in its proper spirit can be synthesised effectively with knowledge. The secret of *karmayoga* is nothing but spiritualisation of service by cultivating the attitude of selfless love and devotion to Life Divine. The pursuit of *karmayoga* lies in making action free of all selfish interests and also in shifting the motive from narrow egoism to the infinite love and bliss that supports the whole world. The Great Love is manifesting itself in and through this colourful multiplicity which we call "world". It is therefore, the duty of a devotee to love and adore this finitized expression of the Infinite and also to serve God by serving His innumerable children. He should see God in every creature and all his activities should take the form of an offering of pure Love to God without selfish motive. He loves God because he cannot help loving God who Himself is Love : he serves God by serving the whole of His creation in a disinterested manner because his love must find an outlet in service. In the sphere of religion *upāsya* and *upāsaka* are mutually drawn to each other by intrinsic excellences and not by desire to secure any selfish end. Giving up of the sense of egoism (which constitutes the real bondage of the soul) is easily achieved only in

the sphere of Pure Love. Mother can easily forget all personal comforts and gains for the sake of her children. It is also easy for man to love that being who himself is a fountain of love. True service is possible only through love and true service also constitutes the test of pure love. When action is performed in the attitude of devotion and selfless love for the whole universe, it assumes the form of spiritual *Sadhana* which is wholly beneficial to the highest goal of human life. It is only through selfless love that one can feel his identity with the whole of creation and can easily engage himself in such philanthropic works which are sure to bring good to mankind. Swamiji has said that selfish man is the most miserable creature in this world. One who is selfless is happy. He feels his identity with the whole universe and God dwells in the heart of such a true lover. A man is always eager to give up everything for a person whom he loves and he and his loved one are not two but one. The narrow individuality which divides man from man is not his real being. The true being of man is the divinity that resides in him as his permanent support. This divinity is expressing itself through all sights and sounds of the universe. Hence, nobody is a stranger; all are members of one Divine Family. Swamiji has said, "The perfect man sees nothing but God". "He expands into one mass of universal love, infinite love—the love that is God".

Summing Up

Truly speaking, God of Vivekananda's philosophy is no other than the Impersonal Brahman that has been described as *saccidananda* in the philosophy of the advaita school. Swamiji has said, "One infinite soul is manifesting itself in multiple forms through multiple mirrors. This infinite soul constituting the background of the universe is no other than God." Like Śaṅkara, Vivekananda, too, has not accepted devotion to *Saguna Brahman* as a direct means to liberation. According to him, ascription of personality to One Impersonal Reality and devotion to such a personal God takes place in the lowest

stage of spiritual sadhana when God, Nature and Soul are regarded as essentially distinct and different.

“We have seen that there is the eternal God and there is eternal Nature and there is also an infinite number of eternal souls. This is the first stage in religion, it is called dualism ... when man looks at Nature, he is the subject and Nature is the object. When he looks at God, he sees God as the subject and himself as the object.”

Next stage, according to Swamiji, is the stage of *viśiṣṭādvaita* when man feels that he is a spark of that Great fire and that the whole universe is a manifestation of God Himself. “We are little particles floating in one mass and that mass is God. We are individuals but one in God. We are all in Him. We are all parts of Him and therefore we are one. And yet between man and man, man and God, there is strict individuality, separate and yet not separate.”

The highest stage is the *advaita* stage when one realises that the Infinite eternal reality cannot really be made finite. It is always infinite and the finite forms are nothing but the different reflections of that One Impersonal Being in different fictitious *buddhis*. This being may be called God even in the impersonal form simply because of the fact that it constitutes foundational principle of the universe. This Infinite is, however, not God in the sense of a personal being that remains essentially distinct and different from the individual soul.

The salient feature of Swamiji's theistic teaching is that he has lucidly shown how a man can worship God even in the *advaita* stage—a point that has not been dealt with clearly and consistently in the philosophy of Śaṅkara. According to Swamiji, worship of God in the *advaita* stage means simply devotion to and love for *Saccidananda* Brahman that constitutes one's own real self. Even though there is *Upāśya* it is no other than his own self. To worship one's own self is very natural to human beings. Even in the stage of bondage, an individual thinks only of the good of his own self and performs various

actions only with a view to satisfying his own self. In other words, a man, engrossed in worldly enjoyments, worships nothing but his own self. According to Swamiji, in the highest stage of realisation also, man worships nothing but his own self : but the concept of self is different in these two stages. In worldly stage, the self that is worshipped is narrow, impure and false, whereas in the stage of liberation, one worships one's own true self which is both *Bhūmā* and *ānanda*. Swamiji thus has given reply to the age-old criticism against *advaita-vedānta* that by falsifying God, *advaita* has done away with the necessity of worship in the stage of *tattva jñāna*. Moreover, the *vaiṣṇava* religion describes *Bhakti* as a form of love for God who himself is a fountain of love, whereas *advaita* does not provide any such scope for *premalakṣaṇā bhakti* which has become a discouraging aspect of *advaita-vedānta* according to some critics. Swamiji has solved this difficulty by describing *saccidananda* as love—a conception which is very dear to the loving heart of a devotee. Man is essentially a unity of intellect, emotion and conation and it is only through the satisfaction of these three aspects of his nature that he can be fully satisfied. Intellect awakens in him an intense desire for the knowledge of the ultimate uniting principle, whereas emotion inspires him to cling to some such being from whom he will be able to receive love. Conation again seeks its expression through different forms of enterprise. By defining the highest being as impersonal absolute and also as love and by synthesising *advaita* knowledge with *niṣkāma karma*, Swamiji has brought about a happy reconciliation between knowledge, action and devotion. Of course, *Pañcadaśī* has given a high place to love by describing Brahman as the object of love (*Prītiṣayātvāt ānandasvarūpatā*). Even then *Pañcadaśī* has not described *saccidananda* as Love. If we follow the teachings of *Pañcadaśī* closely and carefully, we find that according to this *advaita* text, love refers to that *ṛtti* only which has bliss for its object. So, here love is only a means to the realisation of bliss but it is not bliss itself. If love is only a

vr̥tti having *ananda* as its object, than in the highest stage of liberation, it will naturally find no place due to the destruction of all *vr̥ttis*. Such a state, too, is not wholly pleasing to God-intoxicated soul who seeks nothing but divine love.

The writings of Swami Vivekananda reveal that he has not accepted love simply as a *vr̥tti* having its object in the form of bliss ; on the other hand, it is the *vr̥tityavacchinna caitanya* that has actually been admitted as Love by him. In fact, it is consciousness that is primary ; whereas *vr̥tti* is only secondary. If this consciousness and not the *vr̥tti* is regarded as love, then this love can exist even in the highest stage as *saccidananda Brahman* and so Brahman itself can be legitimately described as Love.

The greatness of Vivekananda lies in the fact that he has interpreted the ascetic *advaita vāda* of Śaṁkara in such a charming manner that it has become saturated through and through with love. It has thus become a source of inspiration for those who wish to take shelter in Love and Love only.

ISVARAKRISNA AND VIJNANABHIKSU ON RELATION BETWEEN THE WORLD AND THE WORLD-CAUSE

The world that we see, feel and touch is a fact of experience, but not its cause. As a fact of experience the world is present before us and no sane man can deny its empirical reality. We perceive constantly that every event of this world points to some other event as its necessary pre-condition. The iron chain of causal necessity, perceptible in this world, naturally leads us to think of the world as an effect of some ultimate cause. So, it is both logical and natural for us to ask : what then is the ultimate cause of the world ? An enquiry into the nature of the ultimate cause from which the world has come as an effect, has, therefore, become a major problem for discussion in philosophical systems of India.

Relation of Tādātmya between Nature and the World

According to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, the modifiable cause of the world is *prakṛti*. *Prakṛti*, constituted of the three *guṇas*, is real and eternal and is also an essentially dynamic principle. It is the only modifiable substance and all phenomena constituting the world are nothing but so many states of *prakṛti* which are potentially present in the causal substance even before their actual manifestation. Matter and energy which exist in a particular causal form changes into the appropriate effect-form as soon as the barrier preventing its manifestation is removed. The temporal distinctions between the past, present and future states of the effect are possible only on the assumption of the prior existence of the effect in the causal substance, in the form of matter and energy.¹

(1) Sāṃkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya, Chap. I. Commentary on Sūtra, 116.

In our day-to-day life when we perceive that a jar comes into being from a lump of clay, what actually happens at that moment is this : the clay form of the matter and energy becomes implicit and the potentiality of becoming transformed into the jar-form is expressed in its place. The effect is only the cause transformed and modified in a new fashion. Since the effect emerges from the energy of the cause, it is of the same substance. The effect pre-exists in the cause and is also a real transformation of the cause.

This theory of causation is termed as *satkārya-vāda* and *pariṇāma-vāda* which seeks to explain fully the transformation of one causal substance (i. e. *prakṛti*) in the form of this diversified world. One world-cause is becoming many because it includes within itself potentiality for diversification. It is because of the fact that in an act of production, one causal substance is undergoing transformation from one state to another, that there is the relation of *tādātmya* (identity) between the cause and the effect, from the point of view of *upādāna* (material cause). This *tādātmya* alone serves as the basis for establishing the existence of *prakṛti* as the material cause of the world on the perception of the facts and phenomena of the world.¹

That there is *tādātmya* between nature and the world has been admitted in his *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* by Īśvarakṛṣṇa as well. In *kārikā* 8, it has been clearly stated that the intellect and the rest are both like and unlike *prakṛti*, (*prakṛti svarūpam virūpam ca*). In other words, the effect is identical with the cause in respect of the *upādāna* whereas in respect of the form, the effect is different from the cause. Again, commenting the *kārikā* 9, Vācaspati has said that there is non-difference between cloth (effect) and yarns (cause) because there is no conjunction between them and because there is no separation between them. Further, the cloth and the yarns are not different things because the cloth does not contain in itself anything else which makes its weight

(1) Sāṃkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya, Chap. I, Commentary on Sūtra, 110.

different from the weight of the yarns constituting it. This is because an object differing in essence from another object has a weight different from that of the latter.

Relation of Avibhāga Between God and Nature

From the above discussion, it is clear that both Bhikṣu and Īśvarakṛṣṇa have admitted *tādātmya* between *prakṛti* (*upādāna*) and the world (*upādeya*). Bhikṣu has gone further to assert that although *prakṛti* possesses dynamism by its own nature, still God is to be regarded as the controller of Nature as otherwise the unconscious dynamism of Nature cannot be controlled and channelised in a proper manner. Hence, in his opinion, there is *upādāna-upādeya* relation between Nature and the world, but there is *adhiṣṭhāna-adhiṣṭheya* (substratum-supported) relation between God and nature. God being the substratum of *prakṛti*, is also the substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*) of the world. Now, the relation that exists between *adhiṣṭhāna* and *adhiṣṭheya* is *avibhāga* and not *tādātmya*. The distinction between *avibhāga* and *tādātmya* lies in the fact that the former exists even in the stage of dissolution whereas the latter exists only when causes and effects are explicitly manifested and strictly determined.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa has not admitted God as the ultimate ground of the whole of creation and so he has no need to introduce any discussion on the nature of the relation that can be logically supposed to exist between *prakṛti* and its substratum in the form of God. Nevertheless, if we carefully go through the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, we will find that Īśvarakṛṣṇa has not mentioned explicitly and definitely that *puruṣa* is the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* of *prakṛti*. On the other hand he has faintly suggested that there is a sort of *nitya-samyoga* (eternal contact) between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and this fact has been virtually accepted by him. The argument about *adhiṣṭhāna* mentioned in *Kārikā* 17 seeks to prove that *puruṣa* is intelligising *prakṛti* by its mere *sannidhi* (proximity) so as to make it fit for the creation of this world. *Puruṣa* is not an

agent : it is the principle of consciousness that vitalizes *prakṛti* by its mere presence (*sañtā*). Bhikṣu has defined *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* as that, which by remaining inseparably related to the real and changeable material cause prompts the latter to create the cosmic order. In the light of this definition given in the *Vijnānāmṛtā-bhāṣya*, we can say that *puruṣa* of *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* may also be regarded as the substratum of *prakṛti*, because the all-pervading *prakṛti* is eternally related to the all-pervading *puruṣa* which, by means of reflection, transforms *prakṛti* into an intelligised Nature and gives it meaning and value as the potential energy of the universe. In *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* have been defined as all-pervading.

*hetumat, anityam, avyāpi sakriyam,
 anekam, āśritam, lingam
 sāvayayam, paratantram vyaktam,
 viparitam avyaktam,
 triguṇam avivekī, viśayah,
 sāmānyam, acetanam, prasavadharmi
 vyaktam, tatha pradhānam,
 tadviparīta tatha puman*

No. 11

The last line of the verse 11 means that *puruṣa* is reverse in all characteristics mentioned in the said *Kārikā*, but is similar to *prakṛti* in the characteristics mentioned in verse 10 i. e. *puruṣa* is *ahetumat* (uncaused), *nitya* (eternal), *vyāpi* (all pervading) etc. If both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are all-pervading principles, there is sure to be some relation of a general form between them. In other words, both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are inseparably related from beginningless time (being all-pervading in nature) and this 'nitya saṃyoga' between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* may legitimately be described as a form of *avibhāga* in the *kārikā Sāṃkhya* as well. While Bhikṣu has ascribed the power of vitalising *prakṛti* to God the author of *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* has assigned this task to *puruṣa*. Otherwise, like the *puruṣa* of *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, Bhikṣu's God, too, is *nirguṇa* and *niṣkriya*, all activities being

due to *prakṛti* which is an adjunct (*upādhi*) of *Brahman*. Both God and *puruṣa* are only the witnessing consciousness (*Sakṣi*) and being the vitalising principles of *prakṛti*, they are regarded as the *adhiṣṭhāna* of *prakṛti*. Although *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* has not described *prakṛti*, as the *upādhi* of *puruṣa*, yet the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* provides us with legitimate grounds for regarding *prakṛti* as an adjunct of *puruṣa*. It is due to the reflection of consciousness in *prakṛti* that there is an intimate connection between the two. In the reflected consciousness are falsely revealed (as non-different) all natural changes due to ignorance (*upasaṃpavartini ādadhāti svakīyaṃ rūpamiti upādhi*). Considered from this point of view, *prakṛti* of *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* can very well be regarded as an *upādhi* of *puruṣa*.

Conclusion

Truly speaking, the differences that we notice in the writings of Bhikṣu and *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* so far as *Sāṃkhya*-philosophy is concerned, are mainly due to the fact that while *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* is a thorough-going dualist, Bhikṣu is not. Bhikṣu is a supporter of *Nirguṇa Brahmanvāda* and has, therefore, tried to formulate his philosophy in a manner that will make provision for *prakṛti*, *puruṣa*, *Īśvara* and also *Nirguṇa Brahman*. That an unconscious dynamic force cannot by itself create the universe has been accepted by both the philosophers. While Bhikṣu has introduced God in the form of an *adhyakṣa* (to serve the purpose of uniting *puruṣa* with Nature) *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* has mentioned the relation of *cit* with *prakṛti* as being the cause of creation (*saṃyogāḥ tat kṛtaḥ sargaḥ*). It seems to us that the author of *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* has not described *puruṣa* as the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* of *prakṛti* or *prakṛti* as the limiting adjunct of *puruṣa* due to the fact that an explicit statement in either direction will impair the independence of *prakṛti* and will consequently be detrimental to his original dualistic position; otherwise, there is ample scope for bringing *kārikā-sāṃkhya* very close to the theistic *Sāṃkhya* of *Vijñānabhikṣu*. In order to keep intact the

freedom and independence of *prakṛti*, the author of *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* has used the word 'sannidhi' and not the word 'adhyakṣa.' In the opinion of *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*, creation is beginningless and the relation between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* which is the cause of creation is also beginningless (as both spirit and matter are all-pervading). Hence, it is a mere folly to make an attempt to find out the cause of that which is beginningless. There is, therefore, no need for postulating God.

Vijñānabhikṣu, on the other hand, has tried to reconcile his interpretation of the *Sāṃkhya* with the views of the *Purāṇas* and the *Upaniṣads* where God has been described as the Ground of all things and beings of the world. Hence in his writings, God has appeared in the form of a mover whose main task is to dissociate and associate *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*—the two constitutive principles of the world.

There are two forms of Supreme Reality—Brahman and *Īśvara*. Brahman is Pure Consciousness and unchangeable. God possesses energies constituting *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* whose association and dis-association are due to His operation. Brahman in its real form, is Pure Consciousness whereas in association with its limiting condition in the form of *prakṛti*, the supreme principle assumes the role of a Creator, Preserver and Destroyer of the world. Brahman and *Īśvara* do not belong to two different levels of reality. Both are equally real. Thus the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy which *Bhikṣu* has formulated has assumed the form of a theistic *Sāṃkhya* with a tendency towards *Nirguṇa Brahmanvāda*. This has distinguished it from the so-called theistic *Sāṃkhya* or the *Yoga* system. This is also the point of distinction between the *kārikā-sāṃkhya* and the *sāṃkhya-philosophy* of *Vijñānabhikṣu*.

PART II

PHILOSOPHY OF SAMKHYA :

ITS VALUE IN THE PRESENT AGE

“Whenever a process of thinking seeks to discover all effects including the final one of any object or action, it is to be treated as philosophical in nature”. Such thinking enables a man to work with full knowledge and consequently he is capable of producing beneficial results in the social and cultural life. On the other hand, if a man takes into consideration only the immediate and apparently useful effects of an action and fails to visualise its final consequences, he is sure to suffer in the end. •

Nobody can, therefore avoid, being a philosopher in his thought and deed, if he wishes to attain success in his mundane existence. It is therefore wrong to think that philosophy does not exert influence on the practical life of a human being. As a matter of fact, the approach of Indian philosophy is essentially moral and practical : as such the promotion of social welfare and good of the mundane life does come within the purview of the philosophical teachings of ancient India. Unless there is a peaceful social environment, there cannot be any successful endeavour to attain spiritual perfection. Both material prosperity and spiritual perfection pre-suppose a society in which there is law and order ensuring the possibility of an undisturbed pursuit of one's own mission of life. It is only a good social life that provides a man with a peaceful atmosphere in the midst of which he can practise his own course of spiritual discipline-

Samkhya philosophy

The philosophy of samkhya believes in the reality of the worldly life and lays emphasis on the dignity of man and also on the significance and value of social life. This philosophical system is interested in the worldly-life and also in the social relations of human beings. The world is a necessary stage ; it is also of supreme moral and sociological significance for man to

work for the benefit of the world through the functioning of a pure will which is wholly free from passions and prejudices of the mind. The admission of the reality of the world and its objects which are of daily use in the life of a worldly-man brings the philosophy of the samkhya school close to the heart of the ordinary people who are not willing to accept the view of the falsity of the world and the wordly life. Life of a man begins in a material world which feeds him, nourishes him and provides him with all the material comforts of life. How can such a world be false and fictitious ? The soul itself remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give such importance as is its legitimate due. The natural life is not to be ignored. It is to be harmonised with the spiritual life through the cultivation of humanitarian values. It is not necessary for us to give up the legitimate pleasures of the natural life but these pleasures should be brought in tune with the spiritual prefection which is the final goal of a human being.

Enjoyment with spirit of Selflessness

The natural or the worldly life of a man is harmonised with spiritual perfection only when the enjoyment is coupled with the spirit of self-sacrifice. This type of enjoyment has been really advocated by the samkhya philosophy. According to samkhya, the worldly life is to be grounded on truth, sacrifice, restraint and non-violence which issue forth from the cultivation of sâttvika or the nobler aspect of the mind. These excellences should constitute the foundation-stone of the human life, because these values are closely inter-linked with the peace and progress of man in all spheres of his existence. Happiness or contentment necessarily accompanies only a selfless life. So, the highest type of enjoyment is always linked with the spirit of sacrifice. If enjoyment is sought for the sake of selfish satisfaction only, then such enjoyment will produce nothing but ignorance, greed, hatred etc. which act as pain-producing facts in the life of an individual as well as of society.

The samkhya philosophers have always advised people to effect a happy union between bhoga and tyaga (i. e. enjoyment

and renunciation of selfish motive), by increasing sattvaguna and a consequent subjugation of rajo and tamogunas. Apart from what saṁkhya philosophers have said in the past, it is admitted even today that the cultivation of virtues like love, truth, sacrifice, selflessness etc. in all human dealings, is essential because without them no human society can survive for long.

Struggle against error and evil

According to the philosophy of saṁkhya, both good and evil are the necessary outcome of evolution of Nature on the psychical plane : because the buddhi or the intellect possesses knowledge and ignorance, detachment and attachment, virtue and vice etc. as its inherent dispositions. The stream of mind flows towards good : it also flows towards evil. Truly speaking, natural (prakritika) evolution is a struggle against and a conquest of error in the sphere of knowledge and of evil in the sphere of morality. The worldly life of a man is a life of constant struggle against evil so as to be able to reach the realm of truth and good. A man should not, therefore, be unhappy over his struggling existence. He should not make any attempt to escape from the battle of life. Just as happiness is real, in the same manner, sorrow too, is real; if we want to hide ourselves behind a covering shell so as not to be exposed to pain and misery, then we knew only an artificial world—a world of our own making. The real world—the throbbing and palpitating natural refuge of living beings—will then elude our grasp. Thus, according to saṁkhya, it is the duty of man to face boldly the worldly-life with all its tears and smiles. We should not hesitate to invite sorrow just as we never hesitate to invite pleasures. We should realise that misery is also an aspect of our natural life. Worldly life should be embraced in its richness as well as in its poverty. It is only by doing so that we shall be able to find out the truth of life which is peace beyond the natural struggle of the psycho-physical existence. Liberation is the outcome of experiences—both painful and pleasurable. If we wish to be liberated, first of all, we must encounter bravely life in all its aspects. The saṁkhya philosophy teaches that liberation is the final fulfilment

of the course of evolution of the living and vibrating Nature. According to classical samkhya, there is no God but the purified puruṣa. It is explained that the purified puruṣa is the puruṣa that has gone through the flames of his psycho-physical life and has come out as one who is stripped of all the impurities of a natural life. Obviously, such a philosophy gives enough courage and hope to stand the trials of life without fear and tears. To be liberated, we are not to go out of the world : we are to free ourselves from the painful and suffering grip of the world by living through its complications. We are to transcend Nature with the help of Nature. There is perhaps no other way.

Buddhi : Its place of honour

The samkhya philosophy has assigned a high place to buddhi. (Buddhi), is impregnated with those capacities that are necessary for the physical, moral and spiritual development of man. It is through the cultivation of the good dispositions of the intellect that a man can acquire a noble personality. So, according to samkhya, an effective culture of the beneficial powers of the intellect should form the keynote of the personality-development of man. The ultimate goal of life is no doubt attainment of peace : but peace can only be attained when an individual has acquired human excellences by the purification of his intellect and the mind. According to the samkhya, buddhi is the principle that produces both cognition and feelings as a result of which the feeling-aspect of experience often remains indistinguishable from the cognitive aspect. Therefore, the man who seeks to develop his buddhi, feeds both his head and heart and becomes a man in the true sense of the term. Intellectual greatness necessarily implies nobleness of the heart and these two together are alone capable of raising a man from a lower level of existence to a higher one. Man can elevate and uplift himself by cultivating the higher dispositions of the buddhi, thereby making his thought, feeling and deed pure and noble. It is the cultivation of the sattvika bhavana (i. e. the noble qualities of the heart and higher capacities of the

intellect) that changes an animal-man to a true man of a balanced and peaceful nature. Such a personality alone is in a position to do good to mankind as well as to the world as a whole.

Conclusion

Truly speaking, human glory does not lie in the culture of reason alone. The process of man-making really consists in the harmonious development of reason, will and emotion. This is a process which involves a continuous unfoldment of all moral excellences of a man's character along with the cultivation of higher powers of thought. The philosophy of samkhya which lays emphasis on such a process of 'soul-making' or 'man-making' provides us with a spiritualism which is the final offshoot of a developed humanism. The modern man can join hands with the philosophy of this school in so far as it believes in the transformation of the natural life of man to the pure life of sattvaguna when human excellences bloom forth in their bright radiance and glory. No 'ism' of the modern era can be of any service to man unless it is rooted in a "humanitarian philosophy". Humanity consists in the full development of the vision of unity based on the finer sentiments of love, friendship and freedom : it is the development of such a vision by every seeker of truth and goodness that is emphasised upon by the philosophy of the samkhya school. Indeed, the realistic samkhya upholds a standard of humanity in thought and action which can be effectively followed even in the modern age.

LOGIC IN THE SAMKHYA SCHOOL

Etymologically, logic means the science of knowledge and as such there is no fundamental difference between Epistemology and Logic. Epistemology is a more general study of knowledge than Logic. Generally, sources of knowledge, analysis of their processes with a view to bringing out their features which ensure validity, false knowledge etc. are some of the topics which are studied in details in Logic. Hence, the topics which will be dealt with in the Logic of the Sāṃkhya School are as under :—

- (i) Sources of knowledge,
- (ii) Perception and its analysis,
- (iii) Inference and its analysis,
- (iv) Verbal testimony,
- (v) Other sources of knowledge.

Here, we should remember that the problems dealt with in Indian Logic are psychological, epistemological, metaphysical and not purely logical. Each school has its own logical standpoint determined by its general philosophical outlook.

Perception : Perceptual knowledge is definite cognition (adhyavasaya) that results from the sannikarsa (relation) between an object and a particular sense-organ. External perception of an external object is caused by the combined operation of the external sense-organ and internal organs whereas internal perception of pleasures, pains etc. is caused only by the operation of the internal organs.

Analysis of the Perceptual Process

The factors involved in the perceptual knowledge are :

- (i) The object (prameya) with which the sense-organ comes in contact
- (ii) Pratyakṣa pramāṇa or the vṛtti of the intellect (buddhi vṛtti) caused by the relation between the object and the sense-organ.

(iii) Pramātā or the knower.

(iv) Pratyakṣa pramā or the reflection of puruṣa in the pratyakṣa vṛtti.

Indeterminate and Determinate Perception

Division of perception into indeterminate and determinate forms is a characteristic of Indian systems of philosophy. Different systems have, however, held different views regarding this distinction. According to Sāṃkhya, the external sense-organs receive only indeterminate impressions from their specific objects. Knowledge of a qualified object cannot be gained by the external sense-organs. Sāṃkhya Karika has described the indeterminate awareness as *alocana mātram jñānam*. This simple and indeterminate awareness begins to change into the form of a determinate and qualified knowledge when the mind comes into operation. Both discrimination and assimilation which are involved in determinate perception, are the functions of the mind. After mind, the ego-sense comes into operation and lastly, there is the operation of the intellect resulting in the formation of determinate knowledge proper which is called *adhyavasāya*. *Adhyavasāya* is a disposition of the intellect which is the substratum of all forms of *vrttijñāna*.

Sannikarṣa

It is true that in the available Sāṃkhya texts, there is no mention of *sannikarṣa*. Even then as the Sāṃkhya has defined perceptual knowledge as definite cognition received through the contact of the sense organ with the object, *sannikarṣa*, in different forms may be justified from the Sāṃkhya point of view as well. Classification of *sannikarṣas*, may be done following the line of the *advaita vedānta*.

(i) *Samyoga* to perceive substances.

(ii) *Samyukta tādātmya* to perceive quality of a substance.

(iii) *Samyukta-tadātma-tādātmya* to perceive the universal of the quality of a substance.

(iv) *Tādātmya* to perceive pleasures, pains etc. through *buddhivṛtti*. This can be operative in the perception of sound

also which is in *tādātmya* relation with the ether. The organ of hearing is pervaded by ether.

Illusion

The illusory perception too poses no difficulty. Take the case of the conch-shell-silver illusion (*idam rajatam*). The perception of *idam* is the perception of *sadvastu*. The *idamvṛtti* arises as a result of contact between the sense-organ and the 'idam'. So far as *rajatakāra vṛtti* is concerned, it arises in the intellect as a result of the combined operation of the awakened *rajata-vāsāna* and non-discrimination of *rajata* and *śukti*. Although *idamvṛtti* and *rajatavṛtti* are different still due to reflection of one and the same consciousness through two *vṛttis*, knowledge arises as one.

Inference

Inferential knowledge is that knowledge in which the modification of the intellect in the form of the inferred object, occurs in the absence of the contact between the external sense-organ and the object. Inference is based on

- (i) Knowledge of the *hetu* as invariably and unconditionally related to the *sadhya*.
- (ii) Knowledge of the presence of the *hetu* as a *dharma* of the *pakṣa*.

Inferential Process Analysed

In arriving at the inferential knowledge '*parvatovahnimān*', there is firstly the perception of the *hetu* (smoke) in the *pakṣa* (hill). Secondly, there is the remembering of *vyapti* in the form 'where there is smoke, there is fire'. *Vṛtti* of the hill with smoke is *aparokṣa* (immediate) whereas *vṛtti* in the form of fire is *parokṣa* (mediate). It is because the same consciousness is reflected through both the *vṛttis*, that there is knowledge of fire in the hill.

Kinds of Inference

Inference is of two kinds :

- (i) Vitam (viśeṣeṇa itam. = jñānam)
- (ii) Avitam.

In the first form, vyāpti is arrived at by perceiving the universal co-presence of the hetu and the sadhya.

The second form is based on the Kevala vyatireki vyāpti.

Methods of Arriving of Vyāpti

Vyāpti can be obtained

- (i) By perceiving mainly anvaya-dṛṣṭāntas
- (ii) By perceiving both anvaya-dṛṣṭāntas and vyatireka dṛṣṭāntas.
- (iii) By perceiving only vyatireka-dṛṣṭāntas.

Śabda

Āptavacana refers to vedic teachings only which are not the results of the efforts of erring human beings. Kapila simply remembered what he had learnt from the vedas in his past lives and so the Sāṃkhya ideas (which were not innovated by him) are indubitable.

So far as other sources of knowledge are concerned, they are not accorded any independent status in the philosophy of the Sāṃkhya School.

METAPHYSICS IN THE SAMKHYA

The Theory of the Guṇas

As a metaphysical study, the Samkhya also seeks to know the real truths which underlie human experience. The Guṇa theory which is the distinctive feature of the Sāṃkhya metaphysics is not established dogmatically. It is the outcome of a rational and critical analysis of human experience.

All objects of the world, whether simple or complex, have in them pure being or *sattā* (existence) as their ultimate basis and essential stuff. This existence (*sāttā*) constitutes the intelligibility of an object. Only an existent object can be related to knowledge and can become intelligible to us. A sky-flower, for example, being devoid of *sattā*, can never be intelligible to any body. Each fact of experience is a being or *sattā* and this being or existence is the ultimate factor in an object of experience. It is called *sattva guṇa* by the Sāṃkhya philosophers.

The object of experience also possesses certain characteristics like resistance, impenetrability, shape and form, which are, in fact, due to the presence of massiveness in objects. It is because an object is massive in nature that it can assume shape and can also resist its complete destruction through change, allowing only the change of form. Mass or *tamoguṇa*, therefore, is another element present in the object. The object undergoes constant changes. This change or movement is due to the presence of another principle which is called *rajoguṇa*. Thus *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, which are objective and ultimate, are responsible for all sorts of experience of a *puruṣa*. These *guṇas* are not qualities but substances. They are called *guṇas* because they act as ropes for binding *puruṣa* and also because they are subordinated to the *puruṣa* whose interest they serve. All objects of the world, (both physical and psychical) are the results of the different permutations and combinations of these three ultimate reals. In the psychical sphere, the element of *sattva* which is of the nature of illumination, dominates whereas

in the sphere of the physical objects, tamoguṇa, which is of the nature of heaviness and covering, becomes the dominating element.

These three guṇas again appear as pleasure, pain and indifference from the point of view of feeling. One and the same object is capable of producing three different feelings in three typēs of mind due to the presence of three guṇas in it.

These guṇas are not only unconscious, they are also essentially changeable. They always remain together forming a unity.

The guṇas, when they act together for the production of object, exert mutual influence upon one another and by so doing, they bring into existence new qualities and new substances; but there is not only conflict, there is also co-operation among the guṇas. The guṇas must be arranged in proper superordination. Their proper manipulation alone will bring about creation of new things and new varieties.

The three gunas change in two ways which are known as sarūpa pariṇāma and virupa parināma. Sarūpa pariṇāma exists in the state of equilibrium of the three guṇas when they exert equal influences without creating any commotion. This state of equilibrium is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and indefinite and it is called Prakṛti. The word pariṇāma always implies change or modification which is of the form of action (kriyātmaka). Activity belongs to rajoguna. Hence in sarupa pariṇāma too, sattva and tamas must be related to rajas so as to be able to undergo homogeneous modification (i. e. modification in which one guṇa will not overpower the other). Rajas possesses kriyāśakti by nature; but this kriyāśakti of rajas becomes excessive when there is a disturbance in the Prakṛti-sakti due to puruṣārtha samyoga. In the equilibrated state, there is no excess in the activity of the rajoguṇa. The natural activity of rajas becomes excessive in the Vaiṣamyavasthā as a result of which there are excessive modifications in sattva, rajas and tamas. The result of such excess in the activities of the guṇas is the production of new categories.

Prakṛti

Prakṛti is not an entity distinct from the three guṇas. When the guṇas are held in a state of equilibrium and there is no manifestation of any characteristic, it is called the Prakṛti-state or the equilibrated state of the three guṇas. This equilibrated state (Prakṛti) is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and homogeneous and it exists only as the possible source of energy of the whole world. This state of equipoise is the ultimate background of the world, and is not caused by any other principle. Since Prakṛti is the uncaused first cause of this multifarious universe, it is unlimited, all-pervasive and infinite.

Prakṛti state is, however, disturbed by the puruṣārtha samyoga. Nature is, no doubt unconscious, still there is some inherent teleology (unconscious) in the guṇas as a result of which they undergo evolutionary changes. The inherent teleology means nothing but the disposition of unknowingly serving the purposes of enjoyment and liberation of puruṣa.

Puruṣa

Prakṛti, no doubt, forms the basic objective principle of the whole universe and experience also owes its content to Prakṛti. Even the instruments, which are operative in experience, are the effects of Prakṛti; but mere unconscious objects and instruments cannot produce experience. In addition to these, there must be a permanent principle of consciousness to reveal all the changing natural objects in experience. So, the Samkhya has admitted the existence of a pure illuminative consciousness in the form of puruṣa. Puruṣa in its pure form, is indifferent, neutral, viveki, viṣayī, vibhū, nitya bhoktā, akartā etc. Puruṣa is viveki only in the sense, that it is the possessor of prakāśātmaka viveka and prakāśātmaka viveka implies simply the manifestation of puruṣa and Prakṛti as different tattvas. Here, viveka does not refer to any intellectual understanding and evaluation of the distinction. The viṣayitva (subjectivity) of puruṣa also refers to its power of revealing naturally any object that happens to lie in its proximity. Bhoktritva too, does not do any harm to the pure and indifferent nature of puruṣa. Bhoktritva ultimately implies

nothing but the illuminating consciousness that constitutes the nature of pure puruṣa.

Puruṣa, however, is not one. This is because the Samkhya admits real differences in the experiences of pleasures and pains of different jīvas. There are different buddhis and different pratibimbās and so the bimbās also must be different. Real distinction in effects can be produced by really distinct causes. Each puruṣa becomes associated with a particular buddhi through reflection and due to this seeming union, the experiences of the intelligised buddhi are falsely owned by puruṣa through ignorance.

Evolution

Evolution from Prakṛti proceeds on two lines—psychical and physical. Psychical evolution results in the production of the intellect, the ego-sense, mind and ten organs where as five subtle elements and five gross elements make their appearance on the physical plane. Both the lines are important in the sense that experience refers to objects on the one hand and instruments of experience on the other.

SAMKHYA AND VIVARANA SCHOOL

In this article I will try to make a comparative analysis of the world-views of the Sāṃkhya and the Vivaraṇa school of the advaita vedānta.

The status, which the advaita vedānta allocates to the external world is unique in the history of philosophy. The world, according to Śāṃkara, is a fact and yet not a fact, is real and yet not real, is not imaginary and yet imaginary. In fact, it is simply an enigma for human intellect.

So long as we are in a bound condition, we cannot straightway reject the world. Although the world eludes the grasp of our intellect, still in the empirical level, nobody can turn his eyes away from it. The Sāṃkhya believes in the metaphysical reality of the world ; this is because, according to the Sāṃkhya, experience is always real. This, however, is not so according to advaita vedānta. It holds as real only the transcendental state of existence. Hence, while the advaita vedānta upholds the theory of the empirical validity of creation only the Sāṃkhya does not hold that creation is false from any point of view.

The nature of the enigmatic creation is explained in the advaita vedānta with the help of the category of indefinite which is neither sat (is) nor asat (is not). 'Sat' is that category which always is and is never negated in any level of existence and at any period of time. 'Asat', on the other hand, is that which never becomes an object of experience such as the skyflower. The world, however, is experienced as something real so long as we remain in a bound condition deluded by the veiling power of avidyā. In the state of ignorance, no man feels the falsehood or unreality of the world. The world is there ; it is existent, it is a fact, it is imposing etc., such is the experience of the ordinary man. Hence, the world cannot be

described as 'asat'. Again, when Brahman is realised, the world appearance vanishes immediately. Since, the world-appearance does not continue to manifest itself at all times and in all levels of existence, it cannot be described as 'sat'. It is due to this peculiar characteristic of the world that it has been described as anirvacanīya. For Sāṃkhya, on the other hand, the world, in every sense, is real. It is never realised as an illusion in the manner of the world seen in a dream.

Sṛṣṭidrṣṭivāda of the Vivaraṇa School

The empirical reality of the world has not been equally emphasised by all the schools of the advaita vedānta as a result of which we come across two different views, namely sṛṣṭidrṣṭivāda and drṣṭi sṛṣṭivāda in regard to the status of the world.

The sṛṣṭidrṣṭivāda is advocated by the vivaraṇa school of the advaita vedānta. According to the opinion of this school, avidyā or Maya, which is the changeable matrix of the world, has its locus in Brahman (Brahmapada). Maya is the creative power of God and it possesses the capacity of effecting modifications or vikāras. The world is not an effect of jivāśritā avidyā (avidyā located in the jīva). It is, on the other hand, a product of the creative power (i. e. Maya) of God. Hence, creation in no sense, is dependent on Jīva. Both the jīva and the world are supported by God. Brahman is the cause of creation. The world of multiplicity which is actually apprehended during the waking state of the empirical life as something 'given', is the product of the positive insensient power (jādatmika śakti) of God who is controlling the movements of the bound souls. So, in the empirical life, an individual has to perceive what is created for him by God. In the Pancadaśī, it has been clearly stated that the creation of worldly objects is the function only of God who possesses creative power in the form of Maya. God creates the world of duality which serves rather as a help than as an obstacle to liberation.

*"Abādhakam sādhakam ca
dvaitamīśvaranirmitam."*

The world can be viewed from different points of view. From the point of view of śruti and knowledge, the world is *tuccha* (non-existent). From the point of view of empirical reasoning, the world is *anirvacanīya* and from the point of view of practical life, the world is real. It should not, however, be thought that since *Māyā* changes into the form of the world, the world is supported by *Māyā* and not by Brahman. Threads are first spun out from cotton and then the cloth is produced from the threads. Here, the threads are not to be regarded as the substratum of the cloth. The real substratum is cotton. Similar is the case with Brahman, *Maya* and the world. Since, *jīva* is, in no way, connected with the creation of the world, the world is wholly independent of the *jīva*. It is because there is creation, that there is the apprehension of creation by the *jīva*. The creation of the world has proceeded from *Prakṛti* or *Maya* under the direct supervision and control of God.

*Tamaḥ Pradhāna Prakṛtestadbhoga yesvarājnyā
Viyatpavanatejo'mbubhuvobhutānnijajnire*

Pancadaśī

The reality of the world in the empirical sphere can never be denied. The reason why one has to admit the metaphysical unreality of the world is that the world is self-discrepant. No object, in our experience, admits of a finally satisfactory explanation. If we try to ascertain the real nature of a blue lotus, we feel helpless as we can neither say that blue and lotus are wholly identical (because we are using two different words) nor can we say that they are wholly different because the blueness of the lotus can never be thought of as existing apart from the lotus like the cow and the horse. The relation of *samavāya* will be of no help because then we will need other relations to relate *samavāya* to both the terms and the process will go on to infinity. So, the nature of the blue lotus cannot be satisfactorily ascertained. No self-discrepant object can have metaphysical reality. Empirically, however, the world is real and as such is different from the phenomenal object (*Prātibhāsika vastu*). A *Prātibhāsika vastu*

is more or less a private object of experience whereas an empirically real object is experienced by all bound souls in the same manner. Padmapada has stated that when he uses the word 'mithyā' or the word 'adhyasta' in relation to the objective world he simply means to say that the objective world is, indescribable in character. Māyā, which is the cause of the world has been described in the scripture as *sadasadvilakṣaṇā nirvacanīyā* and the world, being a modification of such a cause, possesses the same nature. The object, however, is not identical with knowledge as has been advocated by the buddhistic *viñānavāda*. The external objects like blue and yellow manifest themselves each excluding the other, but knowledge is always apprehended as a single unity. Had blue, yellow etc. been identical with knowledge, then knowledge also would have been manifested as external and also as each excluding the other. As it is not so, the object must be admitted as different from knowledge. The object has non-apprehensional existence (*ajñāta sattā*) and when the object is known, it is manifested by consciousness delimited by *vṛtti* and becomes fit for practical use. It is not the ego which is creating the object. Both the object and the ego are the creations of *Maya* located in pure consciousness. According to *Vidyāranya*, ordinary human beings have no reason to doubt the reality of *Maya*. From the standpoint of the ordinary worldly man, *Maya* is real and the world is real. *Vidyāranya* has asserted :—

*“Sāṃkhya kaṇādabaudhā dairjagadbhedo yathā yathā
utpreksa te nekayuktyabhavatvesa tathā tathā.”*

“The followers of *Sāṃkhya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, the Buddhist and other schools have established with quite an array of arguments the real nature of the multiplicity in the universe. Let them have these, we have no quarrel with them”. (*Pancadasi*, English translation : Swami Swahananda). Since the world, which is the effect of *Maya*, is undeniably manifested, its existence in the empirical level can never be denied. All people admit, in their experience, the existence of the world. The *advaita vedantins* do not hesitate to declare that one should stick to *Sāṃkhya* realism in the empirical level of existence (*Vyavahāra Sāṃkhya*

nayaḥ). The world view, presented to us by the vivaraṇa school, seems to have developed under the influence of the Sāṃkhya realism as, otherwise, such a strong leaning towards a realistic view of the world would not have crept up into the advaita Brahmapāda of Saṃkaracharya. Like the Sāṃkhya, the sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivāda too, admits the non-apprehensional existence or the extra-apprehensional existence of the object. Māyā, which is the changeable matrix of the world, is indeed a destructible principle according to sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivāda; but if we admit Māyā as a single category representing the jadātmikā sṛṣṭiśakti of God, then it becomes difficult for us to believe in the destruction of Māyā when only one soul is liberated. How can one and the same Māyā be both annihilated and existent at the same time? We cannot suppose that all souls will be liberated simultaneously as such a presumption will not have the sanction of experience. This difficulty however is solved satisfactorily in the Sāṃkhya where Prakṛti is not destroyed.

Sāṃkhya view

According to Sāṃkhya, Prakṛti which is the mutable material cause of the world is eternal. This insentient cause is active by nature. Puruṣa is not the efficient cause. It does not participate actively in the process of creation. It simply vitalises Prakṛti by means of sannidhi and makes the 'unconscious cause' fit for creation. In the process of creation, it is Prakṛti that occupies the primary place and not the inactive consciousness in the form of puruṣa. The Sāṃkhya does not believe in Prakṛtināśa (destruction of Prakṛti); when a particular puruṣa is liberated, Prakṛti simply ceases to create for him. Creation is meant for the bound souls only who have got to reap the fruits of their prārabdha karmas. Each object is produced for the enjoyment of a particular puruṣa; if the bhoga samskāras of a particular puruṣa are destroyed, then the bhogyatā (capacity for enjoyment) of the puruṣa comes to an end. So, Prakṛti does not create anything for the enjoyment of that puruṣa. Prakṛti ceases to be effective in relation to him. Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya school does not affect the life of the liberated puruṣa.

in any way, does not create anything for his enjoyment, does not entice him, does not make him interested, in the world show any more. In other words, Prakṛti has become as good as non-existent for him.

Conclusion

On a careful reflection, therefore, it will appear to everybody that the Sāṃkhya idea of cessation of the activity of Prakṛti virtually amounts to its non-existence in relation to a liberated soul, although actually it is not destroyed. Even Vidyāranya has said :—

“Naparatitistayorbādhah
kintu mithyāṭva niścayah”

(By negation, it does not mean that the world ceases to be perceptible to the senses, it means the conviction of its illusory nature). Thus, according to both the schools, the jīvanmukta puruṣa sees the world, in a disinterested manner, but there is this difference that while the follower of the advaita vedānta believes it as false, the follower of the Sāṃkhya school believes it as heya (of inferior value).

In fact, if Prakṛti cannot create any kind of change, in the mind and activity of the liberated person, then from his point of view, the existence of Prakṛti is as good as its non-existence. Just as the Maya of the ~~sṛṣṭi~~^{sṛṣṭi}~~śrī~~^{śrī} school of the advaita vedānta loses both the āvaraṇa śakti and the vikṣepa śakti in relation to the liberated person, so also the Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya school loses both kinds of power in regard to a mukta puruṣa. If Prakṛti continues to exist even when both the powers are lost, its existence is of very little significance to the liberated soul. The continued existence of Prakṛti is necessary simply to explain continuity in creation for all bound souls.

In the worldly condition, creation is accepted as real by both the schools. The world-cause, according to both, is a trigu-
nātmikā mutable and unconscious principle. But according to

advaita vedanta, this creative principle is not independently active whereas according to Isvara Krishna, Prakṛti is independently active. According to Bhikṣu, however, both Puruṣa and Prakṛti are in a relation of avibhāga with God. Vijñāna bhikṣu has asserted that although Prakṛti possesses mutability by its own nature, still God is to be regarded as the controller of Nature as otherwise uncontrolled creativity of Nature cannot be channelised in a proper manner. There is adhiṣṭhān-adhiṣṭhēya relation (the relation of substratum and supported) between God and Prakṛti. Bhikṣu has defined adhiṣṭhāna Karaṇa as that, which by remaining inseparably related to the real and changeable material cause, prompts the latter to create the cosmic order. In the light of this definition given by Bhikṣu in his vijñānāmṛta bhāṣya, we can say that puruṣa of the Sāṃkhya Kārikā may also be regarded as the substratum of Prakṛti, because the all pervading Prakṛti, is eternally related to the all-pervading puruṣa which by means of reflection, transforms prakṛti into an intelligised Nature and gives it meaning and value as the potential energy of the world. Again, although Isvara Krishna has not described Prakṛti as the upādhi of puruṣa, yet the Sāṃkhya Kārikā provides us with legitimate grounds for regarding Prakṛti as an adjunct of Puruṣa. It is due to reflection of consciousness in Prakṛti that there is an intimate connection between the two. In the reflected consciousness are falsely revealed as non-different, all natural changes due to ignorance. (upasamipavartini ādadhāti svakīyam rūpamiti upādhi). Considered from this point of view, Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya Kārikā can very well be regarded as an upādhi of Puruṣa. Further, it is not inappropriate to say that Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya School is subordinated to consciousness (cetanadhina) if by such subordination, one understands simply that Prakṛti is incapable of doing any creative activity without being related to consciousness. Such subordination is not incompatible with the independence of Prakṛti. Prakṛti will lose her independence if we say that it is only the will of the conscious principle that produces activity in Prakṛti. It is true, that

Puruṣa vitalises Nature by means of sannidhi and thereby makes her fit for creation, but that does not in any way impair the independent nature of Prakṛti. The reflection of consciousness in Nature is simply the exciting force behind creation. It is not the efficient cause of creation. There is no real relation between the world and the principle of consciousness. Prakṛti, the root cause of the world, is naturally different from Puruṣa and is independently active. Thus, even by keeping intact, the independent nature of Prakṛti, we can admit its subordination to consciousness in some sense. In the advaita vedānta also, Brahman is not associated with māyā by means of will because a qualityless tattva can never be supposed to possess will. Considered in this manner, the sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivāda of the vivaraṇa school comes very close to the Sāṃkhya realism so far as their world-views are concerned.

SĀMKHYA PURUṢA AND THE JĪVA-SĀKṢĪ OF THE ADVAITA VEDĀNTA

In the *Sāmkhya-Kārikā* (No. 19) Puruṣa has been described as a witness, a seer only without any activity. The said Karika runs as follows :

“Tasmāt-ca viparyāsāt siddham sākṣitvam asya puruṣasya.”

The use of the word ‘*sākṣitvam*’ in the Karika has led some scholars of India* to assume that puruṣa of the Sāmkhya philosophy is similar to the *jīva-sākṣī* of the Advaitavedānta : but in the Sāmkhya philosophy, the objects to be revealed only

*Dr. Sita Ram Goswami—*Vedānta darśane paramārtha-tattva* page 15 (original book written in Bengali) ‘Puruṣa has been described as sākṣī in the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* (19)

... Those who believe in *sākṣī* do not recognize that the mind is an organ (*indriya*). Those who admit that the mind is an organ do not believe in *sākṣī*. So, pleasures and pains which are generally admitted as objects of internal perception, are all objects to be known only by the *sākṣī* according to the view of the Sāmkhyas. Although, puruṣa has been mentioned as *sākṣī* in the *Sāmkhya-kārikā*, yet the objects to be known only by the *sākṣī* have not been clearly mentioned. It is because Sāmkhya has admitted the existence of *sākṣī* without clearly determining the objects which are to be known only by the witness, its definition of perception given in kārika 5 has confused the commentators to a great extent. The commentators have thought that this definition gives us the characteristics of both external perception and internal perception. But truly speaking, according to Sāmkhya, external perception occurs through the functioning of the external sense organs: internal perception is not due to the operation of any *indriya*. This is *sākṣī pratyakṣa*. Unless this position is admitted, recognition of puruṣa as *sākṣī* is senseless like the utterings of a mad person. (*Vedānta darśane paramārtha tattva*)

by the witnessing self (*jiva-sākṣi*) are not mentioned after the fashion of the Advaita-vedānta. (*Vedāntadarsane paramārtha tattva*)

*Kind of objects revealed only by the
sākṣi-caitanya or the witnessing self.*

The objects which are generally admitted as the objects of the witnessing consciousness (*jiva-sākṣi*) are those which are not cognized by the activity of the *pramāṇas* (sources of knowledge). Internal organ and internal modes (*antahkaraṇa-vṛttis*) are, for example, admitted as objects to be cognized only by the witness (*Sākṣya-vastu*). Things of the world are known through *vṛttis* (internal modes) originating from the activity of the means of knowledge (*pramāṇas*). The internal modes, however, are cognized only by the witness in the individual self without the functioning of any one of the approved sources of knowledge. According to the Vedānta-paribhāṣā, which does not admit that the mind is an *indriya* (sense organ), pleasures, pains etc. are also objects to be revealed by the witnessing consciousness.

Jiva-sakṣi of the advaita-vedānta.

In the philosophy of the Advaita-vedānta, the knowing and the experiencing self is regarded as false and phenomenal. This false and phenomenal ego is a mixture of this (*idam*) and not this (*anidam*). In other words it is a unified category of *antahkaraṇa* and *cit*, both fused into one. So, this "I" of the Advaita-vedānta is both objective and subjective, changing and also the static perceiver of changes. "I" is recognized both as unhappy and as the object of love. The changing aspect of the experiencing ego is known as the *pramātā* and it is this *pramātā* that reaches the external object through the *antahkaraṇa*. But a changeable ego alone is not capable of explaining how different experiences of the ego, happening at different periods of time, can be gathered together round a single and identical conscious centre so as to give rise to such phenomena as a feeling of identity, memory, recognition etc. In addition to *pramāṇa-caitanya* or changeable consciousness, a static witnessing self (*jiva-sākṣi*) has got to be recognized in the philosophy of the

Advaita school. Hence, in the non-dualistic philosophy, the *jīva* or the experiencing ego comprises both *jīva sākṣi* and *pramā-tā*. Consequently, objects to be known exclusively by the *jīva-sākṣi* are definitely mentioned in the philosophy of the Advaita-school.

Samkhya Position Explained

In the philosophy of the Sāmkhya, however, no mention of *pramāṭr-caitanya* as distinguished from the *sākṣi-caitanya* is found in any context. Here the individual or the *jīva* refers to that *puruṣa* which has been caught in the snare of *prakṛti* through reflection. Due to reflection, the unconscious intellect appears as conscious and it is the intelligised *buddhi* that actually gets related to the objects through its modifications. Modification of the intellect in the form of the object is the *pramāṇa* and the reflection of *puruṣa* in it is *pramā*. Although, in the opinion of this school, *buddhi* or the intellect is the real substratum of knowledge, still it appears as if *puruṣa* is having this phenomenal knowledge because of reflection acting in co-operation with ignorance. Since in the Sāmkhya, *puruṣa* appears as the knower of the object, there is no need to assume the existence of another *sākṣi* in the Vedānta sense. When *buddhi* comes in contact with the worldly object, it assumes the forms of these objects and all these forms or modes (*vr̥ttis*) apparently get changed into knowledge through the reflection of *cit* in the intellect. Due to *aviveka*, this apparent change in the character of *vr̥ttis* gives rise to a false sense of non-discrimination between *puruṣa* and *buddhi*. It seems as if *puruṣa* is non-different from *buddhi* and there is only one principle and not two. Here, although the *puruṣa* of Sāmkhya seems to perform the same function as is performed by the *jīva-sākṣi* of the Advaita-vedānta, the two do not possess the same status. *Jiva-sākṣi* of the Advaita-vedānta is the static consciousness within the experiencing ego, the changeable aspect of which is the *pramāṭā*. Both *sākṣi* and *pramāṭā* are equal (*samakakṣa*) in the sense that both of them are false and limited in space and time. In the philosophy of the Sāmkhya, on the other

hand, the *puruṣa* (the *sākṣi*) has been admitted as real and it is not limited in space and time. It does not form an element of the experiencing ego (which is formed in the *buddhi* with the reflected consciousness of *puruṣa* united with *buddhi*'s own conceptual determinations).

Sākṣi or witness literally denotes that principle which is capable of revealing anything independently that occurs before it. Therefore, any *tattva*, which is self-revealing and is also the revealing principle of the world, may be called *sākṣi* or the witness. In order to be described as *sākṣi*, it is not necessary for consciousness to assume the role that has been taken up by *jīva-sakṣi* of the Advaita school. Moreover, if *puruṣa* is brought down to the level of the phenomenal *jīva-sākṣi*, then the followers of the Advaita will not be in a position to raise any objection against the Sāṃkhya theory of multiplicity of selves as *jīva-sākṣis* are many in number.

In fact, non-recognition of *śākṣi-caitanya* as distinguished from the *pramāṭṛ-caitanya* in the manner suggested by the Advaita-vedānta has not created any difficulty in the epistemological position of the Sāṃkhya Darśhana. Cognition, pleasures, pains etc. actually subsist in *buddhi* and the spirit simply appears to have knowledge of objects, pleasures, pains etc. through reflection and *aviveka*. *Ekameva darśanam, khyātireva darśanam* happens to *puruṣa* and not to a fictitious knower formed of *sākṣi-caitanya* and *pramāṭṛ-caitanya*. Phenomenal knowledge is gained in the following manner :

Perception : In the case of perception, say the visual perception of a jar, the eye comes in contact with a jar as a result of which there are certain *indriya-vṛttis* which are presented to the mind. The mind analyses and synthesises those *vṛttis* and presents them to the intellect. Then through the functioning of the mind and the external organ, the intellect assumes the form of the jar (the *buddhi-vṛtti* or the *pramāṇa*). Finally, the consciousness of the self is reflected in this objectified form of the *buddhi* and the object is immediately revealed. This is the perceptual knowledge of the jar. The question that arises here is : who is the knower of this know-

ledge ? According to Advaita epistemology, the knower is the category formed of *sākṣi* and *pramātri-caitanya* (*antaḥkaraṇopahita caitanya* and *antaḥkaraṇāvacchinna caitanya*) : this knower is as false as the known. *Sākṣi-caitanya* (witnessing consciousness) constitutes the permanent nature of this metaphysically false but empirically real experiencing ego ; and due to its presence, the personal identity which is absolutely essential for being a knower, can be accounted for from the point of view of the Advaita-vedānta. In the Sāṃkhya, however, both the knower and the known, are metaphysically real. What is false is the *abheda grahana* (non-discrimination) of the intellect and the *puruṣa*. *Puruṣa*—the seer—becomes seemingly associated with *buddhi* through reflection, and due to *aviveka*, it seems to us as if only one principle is operating in the perceptual knowledge. According to dualistic Sāṃkhya, the objective ground is as real as the subjective one, and *puruṣa* can serve as the subjective ground of knowledge without being dragged down to the position of the *sākṣi* of the Advaita-vedānta. In the Advaita-vedānta, a false knower has been formed to match with the false object of the false and phenomenal knowledge, because unless the individual knower is false along with the known, non-dualism of the Advaita school cannot be logically upheld.

Inference : Inferential knowledge is that knowledge in which the modification of the intellect in the form of the inferred object occurs in the absence of the contact of sense-organ with the object. Here, the middle term is perceived, and the major term is inferentially known through its relation to the middle term.

Śabda : In the case of *śabda*, the intellect assumes the form of the object about which an assertion has been made by a trustworthy person. In all these cases (perception, inference, and verbal testimony) *puruṣa* is the apparent knower through *aviveka*, and therefore, there is no need for the recognition of any other static consciousness in the form of the *sākṣi-caitanya* of the Advaita type.

Cognition of pleasures, pains etc. so far as pleasures, pains etc. are concerned, these are the objects of internal perception (according to Sāmkhya). Mind is the *indriya* that operates in the perception of these objects. Dr. Sita Ram Goswami is wrong in holding that mind is not an *indriya* according to the Sāmkhya school. In the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* (27) it has been stated: *ubhayātmakam atra manaḥ samkalpakam indriyam ca sādharmyāt*. In the *Sāmkhya Pravacana Bhāṣya*, too, we come across the following passage :

Indrasya samghāteśvarasya karaṇamindriyam tathā cāham-kāra-kāryatve sati karaṇatvamindriyatvamiti,

Further, in the *Tattva kaumudi*, Vācaspati Miśra has emphatically asserted that the mind is an *indriya* because it has properties common to *indriyas* : 'The property meant is that consisting in its having for its constituent cause, the I-principle abounding in the *sattva* attribute and not in its being a characteristic of Indra (spirit) : for this latter property belongs to the will and the I-principle also . . . Thus then, being the characteristic of the spirit should be regarded only as an explanation of the derivation of the term *indriya* ; it cannot be said to form its connotation.' (English translation : G. Jha.)

It would therefore appear that it is not proper to assert that the mind is not an *indriya* and that pleasures and pains etc. cannot be the objects of internal perception. Cognition of everything according to Sāmkhya, is due to the reflection of *puruṣa* in the intellect. Cognition of pleasures and pains, too, occur in the same process. Even then, pleasures and pains cannot be regarded as *sākṣi-bhāṣya* in the Advaita sense because these are known through mind which is an *indriya*. Mind is a *tattva* different from *buddhi* and *ahamkāra*. It is to be classed with the *indriyas*. It is because the mind is an organ that the definition of perception given in the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* (*pratiṣṭhāyādhyavasāyo dr̥ṣṭam*) has been interpreted by Vācaspati Miśra in a manner so as to cover both external and internal perceptions. ('What the term *pratiṣṭhāyā* stands for is the *indriya* in relation with the object.

Adhyavasāya is cognition, the function of the intellect : in fact *adhyavasāya* stands for that excess flow of *sattva guṇa* which results from the suppression in the intellect of *tamas* due to the contact of the *indriyas* with their respective objects. This is *vr̥tti* or knowledge.' (*Tattva kaumudī*). Since the mind is admitted as an *indriya*, pleasures, pains, etc. are to be regarded as the objects of internal preception.

Cognition of internal modes : The internal modes, however, cannot be known through other *vr̥ttis*. These are revealed directly by the reflected consciousness of *puruṣa* without the help of any other media. So, the internal modes are *sākṣi-bhāṣya* in the Sāmkhya sense : (that is in the sense of *puruṣa bhāṣya*) and not in the sense of Advaita-vedānta.

Comments

Truely speaking, it is the realistic frame-work of Sāmkhya that makes the assumption of a *sākṣi caitanya* superfluous in the Advaita sense. In the Sāmkhya, no false knower is knowing falsely a false world. *Aviveka* in Sāmkhya implies misappropriation of something by the *puruṣa* which does not really belong to it. Phenomenal knowledge or *vr̥tti* is real and its substratum—*buddhi*—is also real. So is the *puruṣa* which is by nature *asaṃga* and unchangeable. The worst mistake (*mahādoṣa*) therefore lies in misappropriation or confused perception. The reflection of *puruṣa-caitanya* in the intellect together with beginningless ignorance is causing the confused perception of the *puruṣa* due to which intellectual concepts appear as self's own possession. So *puruṣa*, here, is serving as the static background of the phenomenal knowledge, but this *puruṣa* is not a *sākṣi* in the Advaita sense as it does not form the part of a false and fictitious ego which is limited in space and time. By describing *puruṣa* as *sākṣi*, the Sāmkhya philosophers have not made any 'insane statement' *sākṣāt paśyati iti sākṣi*. *Puruṣa*, therefore, is *sākṣi* in this sense in which *brahman* too is *sākṣi* (*sākṣicetā kevalo nirguṇaśca* ..*Sveta. Upaniṣad* 6-11).

THEISTIC SAMKHYA AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAMANUJA ; A REVIEW ON THE BASIS OF CULTURAL HISTORY OF THE AGE

That the philosophy of Rāmānuja has its root in the R̥gveda, Upaniṣads, the Bhagavadgītā, the Purāṇas and the Pancarātras etc. is no longer a concealed fact in the scholarly world. This truth has already been brought to light through the efforts of the eminent scholars ; but the intimate bond that exists between the theistic Sāṃkhya and the philosophy of Rāmānuja needs to be explicated fully.

Historical Background of the Philosophy of Rāmānuja

If we carefully study the cultural history of our country when Rāmānuja made his appearance, we shall find that the social and religio-philosophical atmosphere was ripe for the emergence of the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy of Rāmānuja with its unique emphasiss on jñāna, bhakti and prapatti. This was an age when both Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas were trying to fight Buddhism on the ground of bhakti. Śaṃkara also tried to fight Buddhism on the ground of knowledge : but his highly intellectual philosophy of Nirguṇa Brahman was not potent enough to satisfy the hearts of the devotees. In Śaṃkara's writings, religious worship and devotion found only a position inferior to the meditation on Nirguṇa Brahman. Truly speaking Śaṃkara has deprived God of His Godliness by reducing Him to a false category. God, caught in the snare of falsity, is no God at all. Such a false God cannot awaken that deep love and respect in the heart of a devotee which, in due course, can shape into paramā bhakti. Nirguṇa Brahman, on the other hand, is devoid of mental modifications ; As such, like an unconscious object, it cannot know itself. Such a quailityless Brahman cannot also warm up the heart of a devotee and devotion cannot spring forth in a torrential flow in the presence

of such an absolute. So, just as for Buddhism, K.J. Sanders has remarked that when we go through the Dhammapada, we find ourselves "in a moonlit world" beautiful, yet cold. Our hearts are not stirred by any assurance of the reality of the unseen, in the same manner Śaṅkara also failed to stir the hearts of the devotees by his assurance only of the reality of a Nirguṇa Brahman.

Again, the Buddhistic doctrine of anattā, resulting in the denial of permanent essence both in the material and psychical spheres, already led to the arousal of discontent among some sections of the people who were interested in the positive side of life and were not willing to believe in the emptiness of the world. Śaṅkara's theory of the empirical reality of the world was equally unconvincing. Buddhism was already in a state of decline in Central and Southern India about the middle of the seventh century. It was also the period when the Ālvārs, with their soul-stirring devotion of God, flourished in South India. The most distinguishing feature of the Alvār movement was its catholic spirit. According to these God-intoxicated singers, God is accessible to all without any distinction of caste, rank and culture and that by self-surrendering devotion to such a God, everybody can obtain liberation. The attempt to popularise Hinduism through the Purāṇas, with their Śāṃkhya-oriented theories of creation and dissolution, which started in the brilliant age of the Guptas, has also made considerable progress by the time. So, the ground was prepared for the introduction of the religio-philosophy of Rāmaṇuja which was competent enough to feed and nourish the famished hearts of the age by doing justice both to God and the world of living beings and non-living things. In the formulation of such a conception, Rāmaṇujā seemed to have been very much influenced by the theistic Sāṃkhya and the philosophy of the Yoga-school.

Rāmaṇuja's Indebtedness to Theistic Sāṃkhya

The main teachings of the Upaniṣads relate to (1) the causality of the spiritual principle and (2) the non-difference

between the cause and the effect. Śāṃkara has tried to effect a harmony between these two śruti truths with the help of the theory of the falsity of the world,—a theory which can satisfy only a very few intellectually gifted persons. The average man feels keenly and believes sincerely in the reality of the world. He also believes in God as the Creator and ruler of the world. He has in his mind, a deep love for God who is looked upon as the individual's only refuge. The dualistic Sāṃkhya or the classical Sāṃkhya has admitted the non-difference between the cause and the effect as well as the reality of the visible world ; but has denied the causality of the spirit. The pre-classical theistic Sāṃkhya, however, has admitted both, but the relation between the three tattvas has not been properly developed therein. This task, Rāmānuja has taken up and has done it in a remarkable manner by introducing the conception of his cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman.

Upaniṣadic Sāṃkhya

Rāmānuja himself has based his philosophy on the teachings of the Upaniṣads. In his opinion, his conception of the absolute as a triune unity is formed in accordance with the Upaniṣads. Indeed, the theistic Sāṃkhya of the Upaniṣads does contain in a germinal form the conception of Brahman as presented by Rāmānuja. The Śveta. Upaniṣad tells us frankly that there are three eternal and ultimate entities which constitute the absolute and that these are (i) the powerless and ignorant soul, (ii) the powerful and all knowing God and (iii) the eternal Prakṛti which exists for the enjoyment of the soul¹. Again, in the same Upaniṣad it has been stated that man has got to know the three entities which constitute the Absolute, namely, enjoyer, or the puruṣa, the enjoyed or the Prakṛti and the mover or God.² Prakṛti and Puruṣa are inseparably related to God.

That God is the indwelling principle of both spirit and matter and that all things and beings of the universe constitute the body of God, is the explicit utterance of the Bṛhad. Upaniṣad.³

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad too, it has been clearly stated that God is the immanent principle of all things including even the ontradictries. Thus, according to Upaniṣadic Śāṁkhyā, Puruṣa and Prakṛti are eternally dependent on God and are never separable from Him. It is, therefore not incorrect to conjecture that these Śāṁkhyā-ideas of the Upaniṣads have paved the way for the emergence of the cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman of Rāmānuja.

Theistic Sāṁkhyā of the Mahābhārata

That there is a supreme soul that causes Prakṛti to evolve in many ways (Bahudhātmā prakurvita prakṛtim prasavātmikam) and that this supreme soul is the Lord who makes Nature play with her own creative energy are clearly admitted in the theistic Sāṁkhyā of the Mahābhārata. The spiritual principle is the highest reality that transcends and includes both prakṛti and the individuai soul (sarvāṇyeva guṇair vyāpya kṣetrajñeṣu yudhiṣṭhira). The highest principle has no rival or opponent. In other words, it is the Supreme principle of the whole universe because Pradhāna is included in this eternal being.⁴

Materiality and spirituality, thus, seem to become the lower and the higher phases of the highest being and these two phases, though different in character, are still in a beginningless association, since, such a union is necessary for creation and maintenance of the world. Nature is the mutable principle that brings into existence all things of the world. The innumerable ripples and rythms of the worldly life—its flowers and thorns, its pleasures and pains—all are due to the dynamic power, often termed as Nature or Prakṛti. She is, however, guided in her action by the highest spiritual principle. Such an account of the theistic Sāṁkhyā may reasonably be regarded as having a significant historical link with the Rāmānujian conception of the highest reality which is, in inseparable relation with cit and acit, its two different modes. Further the statement “bahudhātmā prakurvita” etc. implies that prior to creation there was no differentiation between

jada & cetana (sadeva saumyedam etc.) Such differentiation has been made only after creation. It is really the plurality of buddhis that has caused plurality in the case of the *jīvas* as well. Rāmānuja too has accepted that each *jīva* is qualified by a particular acit in the form of a particular buddhi.

The Bhagavadgītā

The conception of the ultimate reality comprising within itself both Prakṛti and Puruṣa as the lower and the higher natures, is present in the Sāṃkhya of the Bhagavadgītā as well. In fact, Rāmānuja's conception of Brahman as qualified by cit and acit in subtle forms can very well be regarded as an improvement upon the Gītā conception of Puruṣottama. The cosmic form of the Lord which was seen by Arjuna, lays bare the fact that even the forms of the worldly objects are nothing but the divine modifications of one Supreme Divinity. The whole universe, with its manifold divisions, is gathered together in one body which is the body of the puruṣottama. Thus the body-soul relation between God on the one hand and spirit and matter on the other, has been suggested in the Bhagavadgītā conception of the three tattvas—God, puruṣa and prakṛti.

The Purāṇas

In the Paurāṇic Sāṃkhya also Puruṣa and Prakṛti are regarded as different forms of God. According to Viṣṇupurāṇa, God is the real container of puruṣa and prakṛti which are different from the Divine nature—a conception, which we find in the philosophy of Rāmānuja as well in his acceptance of natural and essential difference between God on the one hand and cit and acit on the other.

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa believes that puruṣa and prakṛti are not finally independent. These are the two forms of Vāsudeva who connects or separates them for the creation and the dissolution of the world.

The Purāṇas generally devote some section of their literatures to the treatment of *ṣṛiṣṭi* and *pralaya* of the world and

it is in such a section that we invariably come across the Sāṃkhya conception of the dual principles lying at the root of the manifold world. Rāmānuja's conception of Prakṛti and the process of evolution from Nature bears a very close resemblance to the theistic Sāṃkhya of the epic and the Purāṇas.

The Yoga Philosophy

In regard to God, Ramanuja seems to have been influenced to a certain extent by the conception of God as expounded in the Yoga system. Vācaspati (840 A. D.) has emphatically said that God, according to Yoga, is the director of the teleology of prakṛti. Unconscious Pradhāna, by itself, is incapable of producing the world. It becomes fit for creation only when it is enlivened and inspired by God. God, according to Yoga, is omniscient, omnipotent, compassionate and full of mercy. He is kind enough to remove (of His own accord) all obstacles which His devotee may meet in the path of liberation. The word "Praṇidhāna" used in the Yoga-Sutra 1.23 does not seem to be very different in implication from the word prapatti used by Ramanuja, as both the words emphasise the effectiveness of the self-surrendering devotion to God as a direct means of salvation. The absolute self-surrendering attitude, dedication of everything to God, complete elimination of ego-sense and supreme love for God are the ingredients of both Praṇidhāna and prapatti although the latter word may mean something more.

Conclusion

From what has been stated above in brief outline, it is clear that the theistic Sāṃkhya ideas of different ages have gathered together in various streams to find their final culmination in the perennial fountain of the viśiṣṭadvaita philosophy of Rāmānuja. It is, indeed, an important matter for consideration as to why despite such affinity with the pre-classical theistic Sāṃkhya, the philosophy of Rāmānuja has not been admitted as a further advancement of the Sāṃkhya on a theistic line. Perhaps, the reasons for this, may be sought in the social and cultural conditions of the age. We should remember that

the philosophical concepts of a particular age reveal truly the spirit, the ideal and the cultural aspirations of the people. Thoughts never drop down suddenly from above. They grow slowly and gradually in the soil of the country being nurtured and fed by the social and cultural atmosphere of the age. In every age, we do come across conflicts between social and political, economic and axiological ideals. All these conflicts become the source and the support of various concepts which creep into the writings of different philosophers. A true understanding of the philosophical concepts of the age, therefore, presupposes a thorough study of all important changes and developments occurring in the cultural life of the people in that age.

The salient features of the age of Rāmānuja which may reasonably be supposed to have contributed to the emergence of his philosophy can be summarised in the following manner :

- (I) The age extending from 650 A. D. to 1000 A. D. was the age of the great bhakti movement in South India, which was running on two lines of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism. The Ālvar movement was essentially an extra-ordinary overflowing of the heart which found a very deep root in the soil of South India during seventh or eighth century A. D. The love of God and the spirit of self-surrender which were, thus, the noble and prominent features of the bhakti yoga of the Bhavadgītā developed gradually into intense and passionate love of the Ālvārs.
- (II) The Buddhistic principle of considering all men as equal was active in this age. Buddhistic teachings aimed at spreading the ideals of benevolence, compassion and sympathetic joy in the social life so that happiness of the whole of human society might be secured. It was an essential part of the Buddha's aim to assert the equality of all men before law, their equal freedom to mould their own character and

destiny in the universe. The Brahmanical myths about the origin of the different classes of men were regarded as absurd.

- (III) The confusion created by the Buddhistic Śūnya Vāda in the minds of the ordinary people by its doctrine of the total unreality of the empirical world.
- (IV) The eighth century A.D. saw the rise of Śaṁkarācārya. He overpowered the minds of the Hindus of the age with his advaita philosophy which was a remarkable achievement of human intellect. The supremacy of knowledge to action and devotion advocated by Śaṁkara satisfied to a great extent the rational hankerings of his countrymen. Although he succeeded in producing a brilliant philosophy of the absolute, he failed to compose a satisfactory theory of religion to feed the emotionally stirred up hearts of the age.
- (V) Rāmānuja was born and brought up in a family which followed the cult of bhakti. So, he developed from his childhood an intense love and admiration for Lord Viṣṇu as a personal God endowed with all auspicious qualities. It was because of his living faith in theism that Rāmānuja was specially attracted by the pre-classical Sāṁkhya of the theistic type.
- (VI) Since the time of Īśvara-Kṛṣṇa, however, the dualistic feature of the Sāṁkhya had been regarded as its special character. Īśvar-Kṛṣṇa seems to have felt the absence of any rational justification for our belief in God. He also gave prominence to knowledge as the way of liberation. The extreme disinterestedness of puruṣa and the recognition of prakṛti as the independent cause of all inner and outer modifications of the world, are the important characteristics of the classical Sāṁkhya. The

religious mind of Rāmānuja, was not naturally in favour of accepting the rigid dualism of the classical Sāṃkhya. According to his view, if we do not believe that changes are happening in this world due to Divine inspiration, then we shall never be able to give a satisfactory explanation of the teleological flow from Prakṛti. The universe is grounded in God and pulsates with His life. So, Rāmānuja could not side with the dualistic and atheistic Sāṃkhya of his age. The main aim of Rāmānuja was to synthesise knowledge with devotion and also to find the goal of human life in Divine communion. He was also eager to open the door of religion to all persons without exception so that like Buddhism his philosophy too might be of broad social outlook and catholic spirit. For this reason, in the philosophy of Rāmānuja, we find a very apt blending of the rationalistic attitude of the advaita vedānta with the ethico-religious tendencies of the Yoga and the theistic Sāṃkhya of the pre-classical age, saturated through and through with the milk of love and human sympathy of the Vaiṣṇava School. Hence, we can reasonably conclude by saying that in the Viśiṣṭadvaita philosophy of Rāmānuja, it is the theistic line of the Sāṃkhya-thought that has found again an emphatic and rational expression, being wedded to the Advaita Vedānta.

REFERENCES

1. Śveta : 1-9
 2. Śveta : 1-12
 3. Bṛhad : 3, 7, 3.
 4. The Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva-351-17, 18.
-

VAIŚEŚIKA CATEGORIES

Vaiśeṣika categories are often wrongly criticised by scholars. Some raise objections against vaiśeṣika categories and assert that there is no point in including "samyoga" in the category of *guṇa*. Such critics hold the view that it is absurd and arbitrary to say that *samyoga* which is apparently a relation can be called a form of *guṇā*. It seems critics have not paid due attention to the philosophical position of the Vaiśeṣika school. In fact, there is strong logical ground in favour of Vaisesika's inclusion of *Samyoga* in the category of *guṇa*. For example, if we analyse our perceptual cognition of 'a jar on the ground' in the light of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, we find that first of all, we cognize *jar*, *ground*, and *samyoga* in a state of *Dvandva* (separation) and we then become aware of 'a jar on the ground.' (*Samjukta-pratīti*). So, *Samyoga* is different from the *jar* and the *ground*—although not independent. The *jar* can exist by itself ; so also the *ground* ; but *samyoga* cannot exist unless it is supported by *dravya* or substance. *Jar* is the *adheya* and "ground" is the *adhāra* and *samyoga* is a third element. It is neither *Ghata-rūpa* nor *Bhū'ala-rupa*, nor *ubhaya-rupa* which is contradictory. If we hold that *samyoga* is a form of the *ground* or a form of the *jar*, then *samyoga*, being a form of one of the relations may not be connected with the other. So, *Samyoga* is different from the substances, although it cannot exist without being supported by the substance. It arises in the substance and subsists in the substance. It is, therefore, called *Guṇa* by the Vaiśeṣika philosophers.

Samyoga cannot be regarded merely as a relation due to another reason also. Sometimes *samyoga* becomes the cause of action only and does not appear as a relation. As for example, if something is pushed forward by hand, it begins to move. Here, *samyoga* is the cause of action and is not relation. So, a Vaiśeṣika philosopher is unable to treat *samyoga* as a relation only.

Further, the fact that in the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, a quality like *śukla* (white) is treated as an individual, is also not

without rational justification. In the opinion of the Vaiśeṣika thinkers, 'śukla-vyakti' is many in number. Had Śukla been one then the destruction of that one 'white' would have made the world devoid of 'śukla-rūpa'; white, blue etc. being subject to origination and decay, are many in number but in each of the 'Sukla-vyakti', śuklatva is common. Sāmānya, according to Vaiśeṣika, is that for which the same word is always used, and it also gives us identical knowledge in all cases. Hence, Śuklatva is regarded as sāmānya and Śukla is treated as individual. Satta is used as Sāmānya on the same ground as it is commonly present in all existent objects and it also gives us identical knowledge in all cases.

In the opinion of some scholars Vaiśeṣika's recognition of the category of Viśeṣa is also illogical. Now let us see if there is actually any logic behind such recognition. When we take into consideration things like wheat, rice, jar, cloth etc. we find that they are all "pārthiva dravyas" and that they are also different from each other. The causes of all these objects are the atoms. Now the Vaiśeṣika holds that unless there are some differences amongst the atoms themselves, their products i. e. Pārthiva-dravyas, will not differ from each other. Since we actually experience difference in the effects, we must also infer the existence of difference in the causes as well i. e. atoms. These differences are called 'viśeṣas' which are supposed to reside in the ultimate constituents of things. Hence it is not proper to say that the category of viśeṣa has been arbitrarily or illogically recognised by the Vaiśeṣika philosophers. We may not accept the form of realism preached by the Vaiśeṣika school, but that is no ground for criticising their philosophical analysis as illogical. In fact, if we carefully study the Vaiśeṣika-analysis of categories, we shall not find it difficult to admit that wonderful accuracy and 'precision in thought and language' have been displayed by them even in that far off age and that this has perhaps no parallel in the history of philosophy.

SAMKHYA AND THE TAOISM OF ANCIENT CHINA

The Sāmkhya philosophy which is, perhaps, the oldest philosophical system in India, has certain characteristic features which give it the semblance of a naturalistic system ; but the belief in salvation as the highest goal of life involving consciousness as a principle superior to nature is very strong and in a sense, this belief is the primary faith of this school of thought. The naturalistic elements, prominent in the classical sāmkhya , are as follows:—

1. Nature is admitted as the root cause of creation—the material as well as the efficient cause. There is no other cause of the world except Prakṛti.
2. The silence of the sāmkhya-kārikā on the problem of God and the apparent antitheistic attitude of the sāmkhya-sūtra.
3. Prakṛti is the equilibrated State of infinitesimal elements called guṇas which are of three kinds and which are the dynamic and unconscious basic stuff of the whole universe.
4. Prakṛti is one as these three kinds of guṇas always remain together forming a unity.
5. Prakṛti acts spontaneously and unconsciously.
6. Prakṛti is uncreated, independently active and all pervading.
7. A belief in cosmic evolution.

Naturalism and Philosophy of Sāmkhya :

Naturalism, as we know, is a type of Philosophical thinking which accepts Nature as the whole of reality. It denies the existence of anything beyond Nature, behind Nature and

different from Nature. When, according to Naturalism, things in space and time are finally reducible to nothing but minute unconscious dynamic particles, it assumes the form of materialism as well. In regard to the classical sāmkhya, however, we can say that although the naturalistic elements are present in this philosophy, still it is not a naturalistic or a materialistic system. It is true, according to the classical sāmkhya, Nature possesses inherent dynamism; even then, the supporters of naturalism or of materialism cannot read in it their favourite doctrines. Had Puruṣa been supposed merely as a principle of illumination having nothing to do (either directly or indirectly) in the process of evolution of the world, then the category of Puruṣa might have been regarded as superfluous and the sāmkhya might have been declared naturalistic or materialistic in spirit. The supporters of the dualistic sāmkhya, however, have repeatedly said that the evolution of the world from Prakṛti is not possible without cicchāyā, or citsannidhāna or puruṣārtha samyoga. The use of all these terms definitely prove that puruṣa is absolutely necessary for evolution. In the sāmkhya-karika and also in the samkhya-sūtra, there is ample evidence to prove the necessity of puruṣa and the Karikas in which such a necessity is asserted, are admitted as original.

Classical Sāmkhya and Taoism of Nature :

It is interesting to find that the Taoism of ancient China bears a close similarity to the classical sāmkhya in respect of its naturalistic traits. The word Tao is generally interpreted in the sense of the way, the path or the course and the Taoism of Nature, in the sense of the way of Nature. According to many scholars, the Taoism in its original form was a type of Naturalism which had laid full stress on the unity and spontaneity of the operations of Nature. In the book XIV of Chuang Tzu's writing, it has been boldly asserted that the phenomena of heaven and earth and of Nature proceed regularly without any apparent cause. Nature is a distinct entity, a living entity and an independent entity. It acts spontaneously of itself. In the Chapter XII of Tao Teh Ching, Lao Tzu has said "The

Tao is simply a spontaneity evolving from itself and not acting from a personal will."

Again in Part I Chapter XXVI he asserts "Man takes his law from Heaven, Heaven takes its law from the Tao. The law of the Tao is its being what it is."

The Sāmkhya Kārikā too has defined Prakṛti as out and out productive (prasavadharmī) meaning thereby that Prakṛti undergoes changes ceaselessly and spontaneously. When Prakṛti evolves evolves of different categories (Tattvāntara Parīṇāma) then also it acts by its own inherent nature without being impelled by any personal will.

Just as Nature of the sāmkhya is invisible (i.e. not an object of perception) in the same manner the Tao of Lao Tzu is also invisible.

Like the Prakṛti of the classical sāmkhya, the Tao too is regarded as all pervading and as the origin and the merging place of all the things of the world. Nothing in this world is uncovered by the Tao.

"All pervading is the Great Tao ! It may be found in the left hand and on the right..... All things depend on it for production and also return to it and disappear." (Tao Teh Ching, Part I XXXV).

Here, we may refer to samkhya-karika No. 15 where it has been stated that the effect arises from the cause during creation and it returns to the same cause during dissolution. (Here main source and the great merging place of all the effects being the same, i. e. Prakṛti). Prakṛti is also all-pervading (Vyāpī) according to the samkhya-karika No. 10. The Tao of the Taoists also "produces all things, nourishes them, brings them, to their full growth, nurses them, completes them, matures them, maintains them and overspreads them."

The order of Nature, according to Taoism is not only spontaneous but also unconscious. The Taoists hold that the Tao produces things but does not make any claim to the possession of them ; it brings them to maturity without exer-

cising any control over them. Production is both spontaneous and unconscious. It is only when something is produced by conscious efforts that there is a claim to its possession by the producer. The order of Nature is effortless and unconscious. Nature is operating and creating diverse things by means of its own inherent motion. Its activity is not consciously teleological. Things are produced by Nature : if some of them are beneficial for others and are used as such, that also is not intended by Nature. Mosquitoes and gnats suck the blood of man through his skin and live on that but nobody will assert that human beings are produced for the benefit of the mosquitoes and gnats. The Samkhya Karika, on the other hand believes that the movement of Prakṛti is teleological and that the purpose fulfilled by the process of evolution is the purpose of a principle which is other than and different from Prakṛti. Prakṛti is, no doubt the source of the flow of matter and energy but the evolutionary flow is initiated by the sannidhi of puruṣa and it is the good of the puruṣa which is being realised by the process of evolution.

The Taoists, however, do not give us the view of chaotic movements of Nature : the natural movement is spontaneous, yet orderly. There is no conscious controller of Nature, yet there is harmony in natural creation. The naturalism thus propounded by the Taoists, may be regarded as a form of organic naturalism. The harmonious operation of the different parts of Nature is due only to the inherent dictates of the Natural parts themselves. "All things go right as of their will."

There is again resemblance between the Taoism and the sām-khya as both of them hold, that there is no entirely new creation nor any utter destruction. There is only unfolding and folding of Nature, dissipation and condensation of natural energy. The process of transformation, therefore, is a process of gradual evolution whereby one order of being arises from another. "The Tao produced one, one produced two, two produced three, three produced all things."

According to some scholars the one was the primary ether, the two refers to the separation of the ether into Yin and Yang constituents, and the three may be interpreted as the production of heaven, earth and man by Yin-Yang ; from them, all other things have been produced. The classical sāmkhya also believes in the process of the gradual and spontaneous unfoldment of different categories from Prakṛti in a similar fashion. Both sāmkhya and the Taoism have discovered order, system and pattern in the evolutionary flow of Nature. Nature is non-divine but it is not a non-living chaos. The sāmkhya believes in the operation of the regulative forces of Nature which prevent the currents of evolution from flowing in a chaotic manner. Just as the Tao possesses Teh, in the same manner, Prakṛti also possesses niyāmakas or the regulative forces to cause matter and energy flow in definite patterns. Both the Taoism and the sāmkhya believe that in the process of evolution, the multifarious potentialities of Nature are getting manifested in diverse ways. The effects are of the same nature as the cause. While the sāmkhya says that by knowing the effects, we can know the cause, the Taoists assert that if the Tao is known, everything will be understood, "when the mother is found, we know what her children should be." So, using the terminology of Indian philosophy, we can say that the Taoists of ancient China, too, were (in some sense) the supporters of satkāryavāda.

Scholars of Chinese philosophy generally agree in holding that the Taoism was, originally, profoundly naturalistic and scientific in outlook on life and the world. Immortality, that they longed for, was a material one. The Taoists used to believe in the plurality of souls but their belief was in a sense peculiar. In the opinion of the Taoism, different spirits occupy one and the same body. When death comes, "the little troop of spirits" disperses and so they can not re-assemble into a unity. The body, on the other hand, is a unit and so by means of some special kind of drugs, the body can be preserved and there can be the continuation of a living personality through the medium of an immortal material body. So, there is nothing

like the salvation of the soul of the sāmkhya philosophy : but the atheistic tone of the Taoism nevertheless, gets its counterpart in the philosophy of the classical sāmkhya. The Tao, being the supreme concept, supersedes the need for any other concept. In the Tao Teh Ching (Part I, Chapter IV) Lao Tzu has remarked, "I do not know whose son it (Tao) is, it might appear to have been before God." This proves that according to him, there was nothing before the Tao; the Tao is the highest one. In the classical sāmkhya too, no spiritual principle, in the form of God, has been admitted. The sāmkhya kārikā is silent on God whereas the sāmkhya sūtra has said that there is no pramāṇa (i e. means of knowledge) by which the existence of God can be proved.

The assertion of Prakṛti as the primary cause of the evolution of the world and the denial of the causality of the world to any other principle brings the classical sāmkhya close to the teachings of Lao Tzu. Both the sāmkhya and the Taoism were very much interested in Nature and its operation and the Tao has also been spoken of as "the female mystery."

"The valley spirit dies not, aye the same ;
The female mystery thus do we name,
Its gate, from which at first they issued forth
Is called the root from which grew heaven and earth,
Long and unbroken does its power remain."

(The valley spirit refers to the activities of the Tao in all the realm of its operation; the female mystery is the Tao which is the mother of all things.)

Thus, we find that the Tao, in Lao Tzu's opinion, refers to the root cause that underlies the changing phenomena of the universe and also to the invariable law of its operation. It is eternal, all pervading, inexhaustible source in its use and the great Mother of Heaven, Earth and Man.

The Taoist text "KhingKang King" or "the classic of purity" is supposed to be the work of Ko Yuan, a Taoist of the third

century A. D. In this book, the Tao is not only described as the material substance out of which all things come but it is also supposed to display itself in two forms—Pure and Turbid and has Motion and Rest. It is true that the real implication of the passage is very difficult to grasp : even then we can say that perhaps the sāmkhya conception of Prakṛti as a substance operating in different ways under the influence of the different guṇas might have cast its influence on the Taoist thinkers and might have inspired them to think of the Tao too as an unconscious material substance displaying itself in the two forms of purity and turbidity. In fact, according to sāmkhya also, rajoguṇa, overpowered by the tamo results in stability, whereas tamoguṇa, overpowered by the rajoguṇa assumes the form of movement.* The Historical evidence shows that exchange of thoughts and ideas between China and India started as early as the first century A. D and that a Chinese version of the sāmkhya Kārika was also discovered in China. The same text further, asserts :—

“If one is able to send the desires away, when he looks in at his mind, it is no longer his ; when he looks out at his body, it is no longer him, and when he looks further off at external things, they are things which he has nothing to do.”

This idea that purity results in peace and serenity of being and that this can be attained by differentiating one's being from the external things the body and the mind, does remind us of

*The Sāmkhya has admitted the existence of the three guṇas—sattva, rajas and tamas. Sattva is of the nature of illumination and it results in purity. The Taoist philosophy seems to have assigned the characteristics of sattva-guṇa to rajo : power of illumination and parity seems to constitute the nature of rajo-guṇa described as the form of movement : but motion and the manifestation of motion can never be identical. In this respect the Sāmkhya occupies a better position than the philosophy of Taoism.

the sāmkhya view of discriminative knowledge. The discriminative knowledge too is acquired by dissociating serene consciousness from the body, sense organs, ego sense and the intellect. The preliminary stage is the removal of desires for worldly objects.

The sāmkhya philosophers were not missionaries ; they never made any attempt to propagate their philosophy in other countries by sending scholars or by establishing monasteries. Due to the absence of the missionary zeal among the sāmkhya philosophers, the philosophy of sāmkhya could not gain so much ground in China as was gained by the buddhistic philosophy although the classical sāmkhya contained many naturalistic elements which could be utilised more effectively by the people of ancient China to build up their own philosophy of Nature.*

**In writing this article the authoress has made use of the English version of the volume "The Texts of Taoism" by J. Legga.*

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAMANUJA :

ITS BASIC PRINCIPLE

Every philosophical system is based on some fundamental principles which are regarded as intuitively certain. In the philosophy of Ramanuja, for example, the existence of the *Cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman* as the highest Reality that can be known through the Śruti only, is accepted as the fundamental truth to serve as the basic principle. According to the author of the *Yatindra Matadipika*, Badarayana began his enquiry into the nature of Brahman only on the assumption that the reality lying at the root of the world was no other than the Brahman qualified by Cit and Acit. The existence of such a Brahman can be known only on the authority of the Śruti.

The Body-to-Soul Relation

In the philosophy of Ramanuja, the whole world of non-sentient things and sentient beings is assumed in the unity of the Divine personality in a manner in which the individual body is apprehended in the unity of the soul. This body-to-soul relation is the keystone of the philosophy of Ramanuja.

In all his teachings, Ramanuja has remained true to his belief in the organicist character of the Highest Reality and has shown that this conception alone is capable of harmonising different forms of *Upāsana* as worship of God without any difficulty. Since the body of God is constituted of both spirit and matter and since in ordinary life, we find that the soul enjoys happiness when the body is nursed, even worship of Nature can be regarded as worship of God. By worshipping *Prakriti* also, one is able to please God who resides in Nature as its indwelling soul. Thus, all forms of *Upāsana*, made unto God, parents, preceptors etc. can be legitimately regarded as worship of the one Supreme Divinity although the relative merits of all these forms of worship will be determined according to scriptures.

Ramanuja's Conception of Causation

Since Ramanuja has assumed the reality and eternality of acit as a mode of God, he has upheld *pariṇāma-Vāda* which is a form of *Satkārya-Vāda*. The world is not illusory or unreal. It is the real effect of a real cause. The ultimate cause is God who holds cit and acit within Himself as His modes which are, therefore, real. Both cit and acit undergo change of states from the subtle to gross under the supervision of God. The effect is the gross state of the cause and the cause is the subtle state of the effect. The different states are gradually developing from the same causal substance and are deriving their being from it. They are to be regarded as somehow existent in the substance even before their actual development in somewhat new forms. As in *Sāmkhya*, Ramanuja has admitted the reality of matter. He has, for that reason, accepted the description of the evolution of Nature as expounded in the *Sāmkhya* philosophy only adding that the entire process of evolution must be taken as being controlled by Brahman. His point of difference is due to the fact that he has accepted the existence of a *Cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman* as the basic principle of his philosophy and that this has not been favoured by *Sāmkhya*.

Non-recognition of Avidyā as the Illusory Principle of Objectivity.

Again the acceptance of the reality of acit as a body or mode of God has prevented Ramanuja from accepting any illusory principle of objectivity in the form of *Mayā* or *avidyā*. *Prakṛiti*, which is a form of acit, prevents the soul from realising its essentially conscious nature ; *Prakṛiti*, being unconscious, is naturally opposed to knowledge or *vidyā*. It is the material cause of the world and is *triguṇātmikā* like the *avidyā* of Śankara ; but even then *Prakṛiti* possesses a status wholly different from the status of the *avidyā* of Śankara. In the philosophy of *advaita*, *avidyā* is a terminable principle and is not metaphysically real. It possesses freedom to put forth appearances only and not to create a real world. The knowledge of Brahman not only reveals the falsity of the given world but it

also implies the falsity of *Māyā* or *avidyā* as nothing else can shine before the brilliant light of the advaita Brahman. But the *Prakṛti* of Ramanuja, though called *avidyā* in a particular sense, is real and as such it is beginningless and endless. The only speciality about its reality is that it is real as a mode of God from whom alone it derives its substantiality and meaning.

Varṇāśrama actions as the Cause of the Expansion and Contraction of Dharmabhūta Jñāna

In the sphere of Ethics Ramanuja has used the word *avidyā* in the sense of *Varṇāśrama Karma* which brings about the expansion and contraction of the *Dharmabhūta Jñāna* of the individual soul. *Avidyā* in this sense too, is a positive entity, possessing the power of obscuring the attributive knowledge of an individual and creating thereby the false sense of agency in him. The attitude of the individual soul towards the world, therefore, becomes distorted. The individual thinks himself to be the lord of the world and the main purpose of the world seems to him simply to cater to his various needs and comforts. *Avidyā* in the form of actions, thus, becomes the generating cause of the experience of the individual soul and not of the objects of experience which is *Prakṛiti*. *Avidyā*, in the form of *Karma*, thus, serves as the principle of obscuration in the philosophy of Ramanuja.

Indeterminate Perception and Qualified Brahman

The unique interpretation of the indeterminate perception which Ramanuja has given is deducible from the basic principle of his philosophy of the highest reality as a qualified being. Since the ultimate cause of the world is qualified, all objects of the world are qualified. Knowledge, therefore, can never be of any object, shorn of all its characteristics. Knowledge always reveals an object as qualified by some of its characteristics. So, *Nirvikalpa Perception* is not *niṣprakāraḥ Jñānam kintu prakārasya anuvṛtti rahitaṁ jñānam*.

Liberation

Ramanuja's conception of liberation too follows from his belief in the existence of *Cidacidviśiṣṭa* God as the highest

Reality. For Ramanuja mukti means Videha mukti. It is because Prakriti, as forming the body of God, is real, the body of the embodied soul, being a product of Prakriti, is also real and not false, and because there is a real inseparable relation between the body and the soul, the body-feeling cannot disappear in the living state. So long as the soul remains embodied, its relation with the body is real. It cannot have the feeling of *aśarīram* (i.e. without body)—a feeling without which release from worldly sufferings is not possible.

Conclusion

Thus, the assumption of a qualified Brahman as the highest reality and its organicist relation with cit and acit is the pivotal principle round which all teachings of Ramanuja regarding Jiva and Jagat are revolving in a harmonious way. In the Upanishads and also in the Brahma Sūtra, causality of a spiritual principle and non-difference between the cause and the effect have indeed figured very prominently. Śankara has tried to effect a harmony between these two teachings of the Śruti with the help of his theory of falsity of the world. The Philosophy of Sāmkhya, on the other hand, has admitted non-difference between the cause and the effect, but has denied causality to the spirit. It is Ramanuja who has synthesised both the causality of the spirit and the non-difference between the cause and the effect in a realistic manner by introducing the idea that both cit and acit are real as constituting the body of God who is their indwelling principle.

RAMANUJA ON PRAKRITI

Ramanuja has viewed Prakṛiti as a mode of God, or as the body of the soul and through it of God Himself. As there is body-soul relation between prakṛiti and God, Nature is always alive with God who is its innermost ruler. This conception of prakṛiti as the body of God or as the mode of God has been formulated by Ramanuja on the ground of both scriptural evidence and reason.

Scriptural Evidence

The chand-upaniṣad declares : “*ākāśo vai nāmarūpayonirvahiṭā te yadantarā tadbrahma*” 8/14/1. That is to say, Brahman which is of the form of *ākāśa* is the creator of *nānarūpa* or the psycho-physical world of the gross form. Brahman exists in the innermost core of the universe as its *paramātmān*. Taittīriya Āraṇyaka says : “*antaḥ praviṣṭaḥ śāstā janānām sarvātmā*.” 3. 10. 10. That is to say, the indwelling spirit of everything, is God qualified by *cit* and *acit*. The Bṛhad-upaniṣad declares : “*Yaḥ pṛthivyām tiṣṭhan. yasya pṛthivī śarīram, yaḥ pṛthivim antarayamayati : yaḥ ātmani tiṣṭhan. . yasyātmā śarīram* etc. : 3.7.3...22. That is to say, Brahman is the indwelling spirit of the earth which constitutes its body. Brahman is also the inner controller of the earth. The soul, too, is the body of Brahman : Brahman resides in the soul as the inner controller etc.

In the Viṣṇupurāṇa, it has been stated that the whole world represents a dynamic power of God : (*akṣaram tatparambrahma kṣaram sarvamidam jugat. . parasya brahmanah saktistathedam—akhilam jagat* : 1/22/55,56. Thus, prakṛiti being the body of God or power of God is moved into all its transformations by God Himself. The primeval causal entity possessing three different types of qualities in the forms of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* is not, therefore, an independent category like the prakṛiti of the sāmkhya school. It is wholly controlled by God who

is its sole ruler and refuge. Prakṛti is a body as well as a mode of God. When nature is moved into a manifested condition, we have the state of creation and when God withholds Prakṛti from transformations, we have the state of dissolution. Creation and dissolution are two different states of prakṛti brought about by God Himself.

Reason

Reason also speaks in favour of this theory as it seeks to bring about a satisfactory reconciliation between realism and idealism. Realism in its anxious attempt to free object from its dependence on thought, ultimately develops the abortive tendency of reducing consciousness or thought to things or objects. Similarly, idealism by reducing things to thoughts and viewing reality as an intellectual construction, tends towards subjectivism and solipsism. Ramanuja, by recognising thinker and the object of thought as eternal modes of God, has corrected the defects of realism and idealism : he has also shown a satisfactory method of bridging over the gulf between spirit and matter which is ordinarily created by dualistic systems.

Prakṛti as conceived by Ramanuja :

When Ramanuja has described prakṛti as the body of God, he has not used the word "body" in the ordinary sense of the *bhogāyatana* of a *jīva*. Prakṛti constitutes the body of God since it is a substance which is wholly dependent on God and is also subservient to Him in every sense. Nature is guided and controlled by God, and serves the purpose and the ideal which are inherent in the nature of God. In other words, prakṛti derives its meaning and sustenance wholly from its Lord. As body of God, prakṛti is both different and non-different from Him. The feeling of non-difference is due to the relation of *aprithaksiddhi* that exists between Nature and God.

Prakṛti is, however, the changeable matrix of the world. It passes through different stages thereby creating different transformations. In the philosophy of Ramanuja, prakṛti is a substance possessing *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* as qualities. It is

not an equilibrated state of three types of subtle substances like *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. Here at every stage of evolution, *prakṛti* is moved by God and it is through the will of God that she acquires new characteristics in the different evolutionary stages. It is due to its association with *prakṛti* that a worldly soul is deprived of its natural knowledge and bliss and is made to suffer miserably in this empirical life. *Prakṛti* for that reason is called *avidyā*. It is also called *māyā* as it brings into existence enormous diversities and differences.

Prakṛti is essentially dynamic—a perpetual flux without any stagnation anywhere. For this reason, *Prakṛti* has been described as *asat* in the *śruti*. The word *asat* implies (in regard to *prakṛti*) instability, dynamism and indeterminate nature and not illusoriness. *Prakṛti* has been called *anitya* in the same sense. The word “*nāsti*” also refers to this essentially mutative nature of *prakṛti*. In the causal state, *prakṛti* is subtle and undifferentiated ; but in the effect-state, it evolves itself into many varieties of names and forms constituting the empirical world. *Prakṛti* in the subtle state is called *mūla prakṛti* and *mūla prakṛti* is not of any practical use. It is because *mūla Prakṛiti* always remains in the subtle and undifferentiated form that it is called *tamaḥ* or *avyakta*. When *prakṛti* reaches the creative stage, it is called *kṣara* because of its constant changes into various gross forms.

Although the three qualities of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* are separately mentioned, yet they do not preserve their independent existence when they get mixed up in the form of a particular object. Their existence can be inferred only on the evidence of their effects.

Causality of Prakṛti

Though Ramanuja has recognised *prakṛti* as the mutable material cause of the universe, thereby holding a view similar to that of the *sāmkhya*, still in one important point Rāmānuja differs wholly from the view of the *sāmkhya* school. The classical

sāṃkhya holds that *prakṛti* is wholly independent and is not guided or controlled in her evolutionary process by any spiritual principle. It is the nature of *prakṛti* to change in the form of this world and it is doing so quite automatically like the spontaneous flow of milk from the udders of the cow. *Prakṛti* possesses unconscious teleology as a result of which it can carry on the processes of evolution and dissolution independently. The way in which unconscious *prakṛti* has been equipped with all forces and laws, necessary for creating the universe, however, logically suggests a mechanistic interpretation of the world. The concept of unconscious teleology, introduced to emphasise the fact that the evolutionary process is moving towards a final goal, i.e. the goal of the spirit, does not make any appreciable improvement in the *sāṃkhya* position. Teleological movement inherent in an unconscious but absolutely independent principle is inconceivable. If it is further said that it is not a wholly unconscious nature but a *cetanāviṣṭā prakṛti* that creates the world for the benefit of the living beings then also the teleological movement of *prakṛti* will have to be explained as the result of the infusion of consciousness into it. Moreover, if the cause is wholly unconscious and wholly independent of a spiritual principle, then the effect of such a cause will never be the result of an inner growth of the cause planned and willed by a conscious being to fit into the scheme of this world of living beings. Under such circumstances, the effect will simply be a sequential condition appearing after the appearances of its invariable and unconditional causal state. We shall therefore be left with three *guṇas* moving according to their own laws of motion almost in a mechanical way and making the world a disenchanted world of the modern mechanical science of physics : the world will, indeed, be a world robbed of all its charms and fascinations. These difficulties have been fully removed by Ramanuja. For Ramanuja, causal relation means inner growth and spiritual development. *Prakṛti* is controlled and made to yield different products by God who is the inner self of all living beings and non-living things.

The universe is rooted in God and pulsates with His life. Change and diversities of Nature are so created as to adopt themselves to the spiritual progress of the *jivas*. Perfection of individual souls is the real purpose of the process of evolution. The will of God is the primary cause that produces changes in nature and progress in individual souls. It is by knowing Him as the inner self of both *cit* and *acit* that everything else is known. Real cause, therefore, is the Divine urge that creates a universe—the goal and foundation of which are Brahman itself. This is real teleology, as it refers to God and not to an independent *prakṛti* as the final cause of all things and beings of the world.*

* The author has written a comprehensive work entitled "*A critical study of the philosophy of Ramanuja*". In this work her treatment of the Ramanuja's epistemology as compared with other realistic schools in India is specially praiseworthy. The book has been published by Messrs Chowkhamba Sanskrit series Office, Varanasi. (Rs. 25/).
—Editor.

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND LIFE

This is the age of atomic energy. The rapid progress of science, in all walks of life, has stimulated the egoistic confidence of human beings to such an extent that they are, now, unwilling to admit the existence of any higher spiritual power in the form of God. A keen fight between Science and Philosophy or between Philosophy and Religion is constantly in evidence. Scientifically oriented minds, nowadays, turn a deaf ear to philosophical and religious teachings. Of course in this fight, Philosophy is sometimes treated with sympathy and consideration, but Religion has not had the fortune of listening to sweet words of endearment from the staunch followers of Modern Science.

The followers of materialistic science describe religion as opium for the common man. Religion, in their opinion, acts like poison and life-destroying medicine so far as common people are concerned. The rich people are always exploiting the common man in the name of Religion. So, if common people are to be saved, Religion should be banished from the human society. This is the attitude of the present day world. This anti-philosophical and anti-religious attitude of human beings is, however, not beneficial for the all-round progress of human life. In fact, it is the immortal teachings of Philosophy and Religion that can help human beings to have a taste of the Life Infinite and can also endow them with all the excellences befitting human mind.

Material Happiness

Science can, no doubt, help man to increase the creature comforts of life. Scientific achievements have increased largely the material happiness and prosperity of mankind. Science really opens up for human beings the realm of material enjoyment (preyajagat).

Desires for material gain and material prosperity are the spontaneous upsurges of the animal nature of man. These desires can be fulfilled to a certain extent by the Science. But then the question arises, *tataḥ kim*, what does this satisfaction finally lead to ? Does a human being enjoy eternal peace by running after the fleeting objects of the changing world ? The answer is negative in the words of Manu “*Na Jātu Kāmaḥ Kāmānāmūpabhogena Śāmyati*” (Desires cannot be stopped by enjoyment). Enjoyment which lacks the spirit of sacrifice can never deliver real good to human society. It is the man, who, while enjoying, also thinks of others and takes into consideration the benefit and happiness of others, can work truly for the enhancement of the total good of his society. It is due to this fact that the philosophers of our country have made *aparigraha* the foundation stone of Indian social life and culture. In the negative aspect, *aparigraha* implies giving up the spirit of selfish monopoly after realising the evil that results from such greed. In the positive sense, on the other hand, it means giving every man what is his due and also administering justice to all in a spirit of Love and Sacrifice. In other words, *aparigraha* means renunciation of the ego-centric attitude of life which is always in conflict with social life and social good. One who possesses the spirit of *aparigraha*, also possesses all the excellences of human mind and such a man really becomes the asset of human society. Now, the annihilation of the ego-centric attitude can never be brought about by scientific progress. Scientific achievements which increase personal comforts, really strengthen the ego-centric attitude of a human being and encourage him to think that the world is meant for his own enjoyment only. What do we visualise in the present day world ? Do we not find that due to the strengthening of narrow egoism, people have lost sight of real and permanent peace ? Physical comforts of human beings have increased, no doubt, but there is definite loss of mental peace and balance. Peace can be perceived nowhere—neither in the life of the society, nor in the life of the state.

Now, cultivation of the spirit of *aparigraha* or annihilation of the narrow egohood is possible only if we turn our eyes to philosophy and religion and seek to churn out the man-making or soul-making devices from their bosoms. Mere scientific knowledge cannot awaken moral excellences in man; and when devoid of moral excellences, man ceases to be a man in the true sense of the term. In fact, the present day crisis in the national and international fields, is mainly due to the lack of human excellences in man. Man is not only a rational and social animal, he is also a moral being and it is because he is a moral being that he is able to build up a social life based on mutual love, mutual respect and sacrifice for mutual good. The main aim of man should, therefore, be a movement not only towards a scientific knowledge that aims at revealing the secrets of nature and life, but also towards the philosophical and religious knowledge of the true nature of man as a moral and spiritual being.

What I have stated above, does not, however, mean that Indian Philosophy teaches anti-materialism. In fact, Indians also do not admit an absolute separation between the material and the spiritual. Material happiness and comforts are, no doubt, necessary, but they are of an inferior value. The highest value lies in the realisation of the ethico-metaphysical being of man. Life begins in a material world and this world does charm a man, nourish him and provide him with all the material necessities of life. The spiritual being remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give some importance. Here, Science comes to our aid : but man has also got to realise his inner essence as moral and spiritual being without which he will not be able to occupy a higher and more dignified position on earth than the lower animals. This realisation, a man can attain only through Philosophy and Religion. Hence, if man has got to live as man, he can never do without Philosophy and Religion.

*Origin of Philosophy and Religion according to Indian
view and their relation to human-life*

Whenever we reflect on the nature of the world, we find that

nothing here abides or endures forever. All things and beings of the world are subject to birth, decrease, increase, change, decay and death. There is not a single worldly thing that bears the stamp of eternity. The darkness of the night is dispelled completely by the radiant glow of the morning sun, but as soon as the sun sets in the evening, there is the re-appearance of the nocturnal darkness. The rose plant, first of all, puts forth leaves, then buds and then the brilliantly hued flower. The wonderful odour of the flower delights the heart of many people. But how long does this delightful object last ? Only for a very short period. The petals of the flower wither away within a short period of time and all the glory and brightness of the flower become dust and ashes in a second.

This changing aspect of the world has stirred the human mind from the very first day of human existence and has made him restless, searching and meditative. The questions generally asked are :

Why are the things of the world subject to decay and death ? Where from do these things come into existence and where do they go when they are destroyed ? Is there any invisible power or invisible being that causes constant changes in the world ? Is this invisible being the source and the merging place of all worldly objects ?

It is this sort of quest that lies at the root of all philosophical and religious thinking. In fact, this type of query is the origin of Philosophy and Religion.

Man realises that his love for happiness and freedom is spontaneous and natural. He cannot stand sorrows and disappointments which always create an attitude of aversion in him. No doubt, he has to obey the laws of Nature but he always shows intense eagerness for freedom from the shackles of Nature. Despair, sorrow and frustration result in a feeling of imperfection and helplessness which torment human minds. Happiness, on the other hand, is always the sign of perfection

and a source of hope and optimism. Where there is happiness, there is the feeling of completeness and perfection. The primary motive of a human being is, therefore, to find out the ultimate source of happiness and freedom which will enable him to free himself from the state of subjection to Natural powers. It is because of this fact that Philosophy and Religion which are nothing but the quest of Truth, bliss and freedom, are very intimately connected with human-life. The human-life is regulated mainly by the intellect and the feelings and emotions—by knowledge and love and these forces are nourished and cultivated through Philosophy and Religion. The thorough and proper cultivation of the intellect makes a man conscious of the infinite nature of knowledge and a progressive culture of nobler emotions enables him to taste the inexplicable sweetness and happiness of Infinite Love and emotion.

Love eternal or bliss infinite is one with infinite and eternal knowledge. As soon as the intellect is enriched with the knowledge of the infinite and the eternal, the human heart melts quickly with love for all creation. He, then, forgets his narrow egoism, forgets all differences between man and man and feels an intense urge to do good to all, to be the friend of all, to be the living emblem of universal love and fellowship with all mankind. In other words, the stream of knowledge mingles with the stream of love and creates the sacred confluence of human-life. Both Philosophy and Religion deal with that aspect of human-life in which pure knowledge and pure love flow—spontaneously in abundance. That aspect of human-life which manifests its infinity and greatness in knowledge, love and action, bears the stamp of true manhood according to both Philosophy and Religion. According to Indian Philosophy, the true being of man consists of sat, cit and ananda and according to Indian Religion, the true being of man is nothing but a part of the Divine Being endowed with infinite auspicious qualities. Man is essentially Divine in nature—this is what Indian Religion teaches. Man is essentially non-attached and pure consciousness—this is

what Indian Philosophy teaches. In fact, a true philosopher is also a truly religious man. The Gita says :—

*Vītarāgabhayakrodhā
manmayā mānupāśṛtāḥ
Vahabo Jnānatapasā Pūtā
madbhāvamāgatāḥ*

In India, the purpose of Religion is to awaken in man his true, good and loving nature whereas the purpose of Philosophy is to make him perfect in all respects and truly wise. It would, therefore, appear that both Philosophy and Religion have similar approach so far as glorification of human life is concerned.

When by knowledge, the philosopher realises his oneness with the Life Infinite, the soul becomes the object of love and devotion for him ; In this stage, the mind of the wise man becomes permeated with Infinite Love and goodwill for all. Just as God is the object of love for a devotee, in the same manner, the soul becomes the object of love for a wise man.

God is not only the object of love for the devotee, He is also of the nature of Infinite Love. The soul, for a wise man too, is of the form of love. In the Pancadasi, it has been stated “Yat ānanda rūpo na bhavati sa niratiśaya premaviśayo na bhavati”. There is no difference between pure love and pure knowledge. The feeling of unity which the wise seeks to realise through knowledge, the devotee seeks to realise through love and adoration. It is only when both the intellect and emotion are equally purified and made perfect that infinite knowledge and infinite love flood the mind of a wise man or of a devotee of God. If with an increase in knowledge, there is no corresponding expansion of the human heart or if with an expansion of the human heart there is no corresponding increase in human knowledge then nobody can have the feeling of completeness in him. Both knowledge and love are necessary to make buddhi purely

sāttvika in nature. Sattva guṇa is of the nature of knowledge and also of the nature of happiness and love. So, if buddhi becomes sāttvika in nature, then there is not only the awakening of knowledge in the intellect, there is also the awakening of love and good will in the heart of a man. It is through Philosophy and Religion that knowledge and love can be properly cultivated and the life of a human being can be morally regenerated and spiritually divinised. The Indian Philosophical tradition holds that human knowledge can be complete and perfect only when the human being feels the pulsation of the Life Infinite in and through each atom and molecule of the wonderful world. He also feels his identity with the Infinite Life, nay, with the whole of creation. The wise feels the existence of the Life Divine in his own body and mind, in the bodies and minds of other human beings, in the bodies of the insects, in plants and trees, in rivers and the mountains. So, the whole world becomes the "Sva" of the wise man. The infinite is realised through the finite, the mortal through the immortal. Since the wise man transcends all distinctions and differences in knowledge, he does not differentiate between man and man on the basis of caste, creed and sex. Men and animals, low and high, are the same in his eyes. He has then a broader and higher vision of man and the universe. Philosophy, thus, teaches human beings to cultivate this broader vision of life if not fully, at least partially. This is because one who develops such a noble vision gives up fully the spirit of selfishness with the result that he does not feel any difficulty either in giving everyman what is his due or in administering justice to all in a spirit of love and service. Indeed, it is the desire for selfish gain that acts as a violent force of social disintegration and prevents man from living the life of noble and the peaceful co-existence. Hence, if human beings sincerely desire to live in peace and harmony, they should try to cultivate such a broad outlook which can result only from such philosophical knowledge.

Religion, on the other hand, enables a man to develop such

a broad outlook on life and the universe through love and devotion. In the eyes of the devotee, the whole world is a finite and non-eternal manifestation of the Infinite grandeur and richness of an eternal God.

Ekaikam jātam vahudhā

vikurvan

Asmin kṣetre saṁ carati eṣa

devaḥ

In the eyes of the devotee,

Eko hi rudraḥ na dvītiyāya

tasthuḥ

Ya imān locān īśate īś nibhiḥ

Even the smallest insect of the world manifests divinity through its being

Pūrṇamadaḥ pūrṇamidam

Pūrṇāt pūrṇamuadcyate

Pūrṇasya pūrṇamādāya

Pūrṇame vāvaśi syate.

To feel the existence of God in all sights and sounds, things and beings of the world is what is spoken of as love or devotion. The devotee feels intensely his brotherhood with the whole of creation and this feeling helps him to transcend the narrow egoistic limit of animal existence. It also enriches him with all the excellences of human mind. Thus, both Philosophy and Religion are intimately related to human life in the sense that these two alone aim at making man a true human being, a true representative of the Life Divine.

Quest for Supreme

In India, Religion and Philosophy are not treated separately. Both occupy an important place in human-life. All intellectual or philosophical speculations have an important bearing on practical life. The betterment of life or spiritual regeneration forms the ideal of both, Philosophy and Religion, in India. In both, we find an infinite quest for the supreme of human-life. Darshana or seeing melts into being. To see the truth is

to believe it, and to believe the truth is to be the truth. Thus Philosophy or Darshana is naturally transformed into Religion.

Further, religious teachings can be accepted under two circumstances :—

- (1) In the state of knowledge.
- (2) In the state of ignorance.

In the state of knowledge, a man becomes conscious of the result that will accrue to him from the religious practices, he also reflects on them, considers and evaluates them and then embraces the religion and practises it seriously and sincerely.

Now, reflection, consideration, evaluation etc. constitute Philosophical thinking and hence in the state of knowledge philosophical reflection finds a very important place in religious thought of a man. Whenever an event or an object happens to take place in practical life, we become acquainted with its apparent changes. But beyond these apparent changes, there is a final culmination. Philosophical quest starts with the apparent changes so as to reach the final stage. A wise devotee practises religious rites but at the same time he also reflects on the final results of such practices. In other words, in the life of a wise devotee, philosophical reflection occupies a very important place. In the case of an ignorant devotee, such philosophical reflection is not, however, possible ; but philosophical matter is still present in his religious thinking. He listens to ethical discourses, remembers God through hymns and divine songs and also becomes eager to do good to the human society. It is only the philosophical reflection about all these things that is not prominent in his mind. Hence, it is evident that Religion can never be divorced totally from Philosophy.

Religious Rites

In truth, those religious rites which aim at human well-being, those moral practices which lead man to his final goal and make him eager for attaining liberation, have philosophical

thinking at their root. Truly speaking, philosophy is intimately related to every branch of knowledge that helps a man attain human excellences. This is because liberation or peace, which is the goal of philosophy can be obtained only when a man develops all human excellences in him ; because of this reason, Philosophical sādhanā, in all countries is nothing but a discipline which one has to undergo thoroughly for the purpose of attaining human excellences.

According to materialistic sciences, there is no other entity apart from the body ; but unless we admit the existence of a blissful and infinite soul enlightening material bodies, we do not feel inspired. The human mind has a natural desire for the life infinite. Hence, both Philosophy and Religion are essential for human life, as otherwise, human beings will not be able to have a taste of the Life Infinite which requires prior attainment of human values. Where the society is not built up with a spiritualistic outlook on life, peace is still far off. There is not even good will between state and state. When we reflect on the present day world and its conflicts, contradictions and degeneration, we feel sincerely that human excellences cannot be fully manifested in a materialistic society. So long as the materialistic outlook of the modern society is not replaced by the spiritualistic thinking, there is no hope for moral regeneration of man and establishment of permanent peace. It is, indeed, a hope against hope to think that man can establish peace in the world even after banishing Philosophy and Religion from his life.

METAPHYSICAL BASIS OF INDIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT

As is well known, India possesses a vast literature of śāstras where man has become the subject matter of study both as an individual and as a member of the society. These śāstras have specialised themselves in different social fields. In this paper, I shall particularly confine our discussion to the Upaniṣads, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* & *Manusmṛti*.

There is a general belief that ancient Indian thinkers have kept themselves engaged with the transcendental and other-worldly things only, and that the people of ancient India have adopted only an attitude of over-spiritualism which results naturally in world-condemnation.

If we deeply go into the spirit of Indian culture, we shall find that this impression is not correct, because India has never neglected the positive background of human life. As a matter of fact, Indian thinkers have tried to impress upon the people the usefulness of the educational system, social ethics and good political organisation, as these are the medium through which human beings can reach the highest goal of life which can be called, self-realisation or liberation. The transcendental life or the life divine is being continuously displayed through the positive, the secular and the material. So, the positive, the secular and the material can never be sacrificed for the quest of the life beyond. What India has been really trying is to forge synthesis between the positive and the transcendental, the worldly and the other-worldly, metaphysics and social science. The positive aspects of life, however, are subordinated to the transcendental life. The metaphysical knowledge or *tattvajñāna*, which helps a man to reach the goal of life is *parāvidyā* ; all other *vidyās*. which are based on the metaphysical truth are *aparāvidyā*.

Pure consciousness, which constitutes the real being of an individual, is manifested through the mind-body system. The

body and the organs are the necessary instruments by which the individual soul can have its inherent perfection unfolded.

The embodied soul appears in a particular environment and it has to become related to other embodied souls for the satisfaction of its various psychophysical needs. The social life of individuals is built on the basis of these relations. It is in a well-organized society only that a man can get the chance of attaining excellences of character which will make him fit for undertaking his journey up the hill of his true being. Hence, in India, the society was based on some such principles which would always help a man to attain his spiritual perfection.

The Upaniṣads :

Monistic spiritualism or advaita Brahmanvāda is generally admitted as the central teaching of the Upaniṣads. The social thought of the Upaniṣadic age, is, therefore, based on *adhyātmanvāda*. The Upaniṣadic sages have not regarded the world as *tucchā*. There is no world-condemnation in the Upaniṣads. The world is to be looked upon as essential and lovable because the world is based on truth. The Upaniṣads have taught us to respect the world, to respect the relations that exist between man and man, in this world, to love all, to respect all, to give up the habit of hankering after the wealth or property of other people, to perform all duties relative to different varṇas and āśramas, to speak the truth, to live for a full hundred years by doing good deeds so that the society can prosper and produce more and more good for the benefit of its members. The system of education, described in the Upaniṣads, is a form of domestic system. Under this system, the students have to live in the house of the teacher. The society of the Upaniṣadic age, consists of four classes. Education is absolutely necessary for the members of the first three classes. When education is completed, the *snātaka* becomes a householder as he has got to perform all his family duties and social duties in the best possible manner for his own spiritual betterment. Family, society etc. are the institutions through which expansion of the soul is to be felt.

The social life or the organized life of the people is to be grounded on *satya*, *tyāga* or *aparigraha*, *saṁyama*, *ahiṁsā* and *kartavyabhāvanā* or devotion to duties. These should constitute the foundation stone of the social life because these socio-ethical values are closely interlinked, with the spiritual value which is *śānti* or liberation. In fact, *mokṣa* is nothing but the final flowering of these human excellences. There can be no well organized social life unless the members are willing to sacrifice personal benefits for the good of all. In a good society, no individual is allowed unrestrained liberty to satisfy his limitless greed. Those who can never sacrifice *svakalāṇa buddhi* for the good of all, can never have a peaceful social life.

In India, these humanitarian principles have always been regarded as the basic principles of any human organisation. The Upaniṣads have described human beings as limited expressions of an immeasurable Brahman. Both world and man are parts of the creation through which Saccidānanda is manifesting itself in thousands of forms. It is because man is a part of nature that he appears on the world-stage in the form of a mixed category which contains both consciousness and *jiva-samskāras*. Due to the presence of the thick layer constituted of these *prākṛtika* elements, his real and eternal *svarūpa* remains covered and hidden. The soul which is, by nature, devoid of all *pravṛttis* falsely appears to display an inclination towards worldly enjoyment. Desires too, appear falsely to arise in the soul which is, by nature, desireless. The impure *prākṛtic* elements should be removed, if the real nature of the soul is to be realized. Now, purity of the *citta* can be attained by the acquisition of socio-ethical virtues which have been described by Patañjali as *akliṣṭavṛttis* of the *citta*; and the cultivation of these excellences of the mind is possible only in a well organized society. Saccidānanda is realized through *niṣkāma karma*, *buddha jñāna* and *buddha prema*.

The Rāmāyaṇa.

The similar attitude towards social life and social thinking is expressed in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*

Valmiki, the great sage, has beautifully idealised the different kinds of social relations which exist between man and man as members of a social unit. In this epic, we see the pictures of the ideal king, the ideal son, the ideal brother, the ideal wife and the ideal servant. We also see a very charming picture of the undivided loyalty and devotion which spontaneously flood the hearts of the subjects when they are ruled by an able and affectionate king. The character of each one of these ideal personalities displays in abundance, the moral excellences in the forms of *aparigraha*, *saṁyama satya* love, devotion and dutifulness. If we are to reach the goal of life, then it should be our foremost duty to purify our minds by acquiring human excellences through all our social relations. We should know fully how we should conduct ourselves towards our relatives, friends, superiors and subordinates.

While describing the city of Ayodhyā, Vālmiki also mentions the moral qualities which a king should possess, if the king wishes to be loved by his subjects. The poet says "Just as the highly glorious Manu protected the whole world, so did king Daśaratha. The king, who was true to his word, and who was engaged in the pursuit of wealth, religious merit and sense enjoyment, protected the foremost city of Ayodhyā in the same way as Indra protected Amarāvātī. The people of that city are happy, virtuous, free from greed, truthful and contented with their own fortune. There is no householder who has not stored valuable things. All the men and women of the city are virtuous, well regulated in life, cheerful and faultless in character." The above facts, are evidences to prove that in India, the duty of the king does not end by increasing merely the material prosperity of the people. The king should also look after the well-being of his subjects. The people should not be morally crippled because moral bankruptcy will not only deprive them of the benefits of a well-regulated social life, but will also prevent them from reaching the real goal of life which is *Svarūpa sākṣātkāra*.

The everyday life of the human society should not, therefore,

be despised or ignored in any manner. On the other hand, the social life should be so constituted that in and through the ordinary vibrations of the empirical life, a preparation for tasting the bliss of the Life Infinite is continuously carried on. A successful king is one who is able to remove conflicts between the society and the individual by adopting sound social measure.

Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛiti

In the *Mahābhārata* also, we find the same positive attitude towards social life which is the preparatory stage for man-making or soul-making. The problems of the social life are to be dealt with with due deliberation and caution because the social life will help a man to acquire all socio-moral virtues which will finally culminate in liberation. How the social order can be best maintained, has been explained by Bhīṣma to Yudhiṣṭhira in the *Rajadharmaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*. Bhīṣma has said that the foremost duty of the king is to protect his people and not to run away to the forest to embrace *sannyāsa*. The king should have recourse to punishment (when necessary) to guide people to the proper course of conduct. The king should be learned, virtuous, self-controlled and should be powerful enough to have full control over his people. In social-life, even truth and false-hood have sometimes been viewed from the standpoints of the effects they produce on social good. On some occasions, even truth-telling should be avoided if it produces evil and not good. Thus, the social outlook in the *Mahābhārata*, is essentially humanitarian as the social ideal is to awaken in man all human excellences which will make him fit for the realisation of his own infinity and bliss. It is only when a man attains moral qualities that his mind is elevated to a higher level, and in that elevated state of consciousness, is realised the infinite being of an embodied soul. When an individual sacrifices his own selfish tendencies, he becomes free from the clutches of his narrow egoism. He, then, develops the spiritual capacity of treating all on an equal footing. It is in this level of consciousness, that the individual soul is capable of going beyond his *prākṛta sattā* or limited being. The feeling of oneness with the world does not, how-

ever, mean the feeling of identity with the world of human beings only. There is life in the vegetable, in the insects, in the lower animals and in the so-called *sthāvara* objects as well. The expanded self, therefore, covers both spirit and matter, ego and non-ego, as both of them are the manifestations of the original self. Hence, in India, the social thought, does not refer to the unfoldment of all human excellences only as the final goal of life; the *summum bonum* of life is the manifestation of the real form of *ātman*. It is because of this spiritual basis of the social life that in India, a man is not supposed to attain perfection by performing the duties of a house-holder only. The virtues like *tyāga*, *saṁyama*, *ahimsa*, *satya* etc. start blossoming in the heart of a man who has entered into the stage of a house-holder; but these virtues can flower in final liberation only if they are cultivated with single-minded devotion which is not to be had in the humdrum of the worldly life. Hence, the two āśramas., namely *vānaprastha* and *sannyāsa* have been added to the first two āśramas of *Brahmacharya* and *gārhastya*. In the stages of *vānaprastha* and *sannyāsa* the *yati* gives up even the pious desires for enjoying the fruits of good deeds. The result is that the mind of a *yati* becomes wholly disinterested in all things of the world. This is the state of calmness and mental balance. The *yati* gives up completely the feelings of "I" and "mine" and thereby reaches a stage where he can taste the bliss of eternal life.

*yadābhāvena bhavati sarvabhāveṣu nisprhaḥ
tadā sukhamavāpnoti pretya ccha ca śāśvatam.
indriyāṇām nirodhena rāgadveṣakṣayeṇa ca
ahimsayā ca bhūtānām amṛtatvāya kalpate.*

Manu : Chapter 6.

The virtue of *aparigraha* which leads to *paravairāgya* and pure knowledge should become deep rooted in the mind of a *yati* by constant practice. The *yati* should collect alms once only in a day.

*ekakālam caredbhaikṣam na prasajjeta vistare
bhaikṣe prasakto hi yatir viṣayeṣvapi sajjate*

Manu : Chapter 6

In the *Manusmṛiti*, therefore, we find that social good has been harmonised with the transcendental good. How the social life is to be formed, what should be the duties of the different classes of men, what should be the means of living of the different varṇas, what should be the forms of marriage, how property is to be inherited etc. are the various topics discussed in the *Manusmṛiti* : but all these duties refer to a common end i.e., the purification of the mind. A purified mind alone is capable of realising its oneness with the whole universe. By performing all social duties in a proper spirit, one can destroy one's narrow egoism which is the most powerful knot of our empirical life. The sense of duty always carries with it a sincere desire to serve others whereas the consciousness of right remains associated with the sense of possession which strengthens our selfish ego-sense. Man cannot realise his identity with the whole universe unless this narrow ego-sense is wholly uprooted. When we perform our duties in a proper spirit, we relate ourselves and the things in our possession to some other person as the objects of his own possession. Hence, our social thinkers have laid particular stress on the performance of duties and not on the assertion of rights. Rights are, however, not neglected. Duty and right are mutually related. What is a right in the case of one is a duty in the case of another. The right of the subject is the duty of the king. If everybody discharges his duties properly, rights will automatically be preserved. By performing duties in a proper manner, we shall be able to transcend the narrow limit imposed on us by *prakṛti* ; this will enable us to enjoy the immortal bliss of the life Divine. Hence, in the opinion of Indian thinkers, the social life should be sanctified by *brahmānubhūti*. Enjoyment with the spirit of selflessness (*tyāgavidhabhoga*) which has been referred to in the *Iśopaniṣad* by the words '*tyaktena bhunjithāḥ*' is the enjoyment of the highest type. Indian thinkers do not preach and teach *netivāda* as is generally believed ; but they proclaim the glory of *aparigraha* or renunciation of the selfish motive without which no human organisation can thrive properly. In the family life as well as in the life of the society, enjoyment should always be sought with

spirit of selflessness, sacrifice and detachment. If enjoyment is sought for the sake of selfish satisfaction only, then this form of enjoyment will produce nothing but greed, hatred and *himsā* which always act as forces of disruption in an organized life. Hence, the rishis of our country have always advised people to effect a happy union between *bhoga* and *tyāga* (i.e., enjoyment and renunciation of selfish motive). It is the beauty and bliss of Saccidānanda which is to be enjoyed by us in and through all relations which exist between man and man and also between man and the world.

Concluding Remarks :

The attitude of '*tyaktenabhuñjithāḥ*' does not, however, advise us to embrace asceticism. We are only to enjoy worldly pleasure after giving up the spirit of selfishness. If a man gives up the spirit of selfish enjoyment, he feels no difficulty either in giving every man what is his due or in administering justice to all in a spirit of love and service. The coupling of 'enjoyment' with the spirit of 'self-sacrifice' is a truth, the eternal value of which can be denied by no person. The cultivation of the spirit of sacrifice will always produce good effects in the organized life of all forms in all ages. Similar is the case with *satya*, *ahimsā* etc. In this age of science also, the value of *satya aparigraha*, *saṁyama* and *ahimsā* cannot be minimised. The ultimate goal of life is, no doubt, attainment of *śānti* or liberation, but *śānti* can be attained only when one has acquired human excellences by performing his social duties in a spirit of selfless service. One should, first of all, attain perfection as a man and then only he will be in a position to become Brahman. It is only a man who can attain liberation.

The Indian scriptures have, no doubt, praised, *mokṣa* in laudable words : this is because *śānti* or peace is needed in every form of corporate life. A society cannot increase *artha* and *kāma* without creating a peaceful atmosphere.

Even in *Kāmasāstra*, *abhyudaya* and *niḥśreyasa* have been described as the final goal of life. This does not mean that there can be no liberation without the practice of *kāma*. On

the other hand, it means that one who enjoys *kāma* but keeps his mind fixed on *śānti*, can enjoy *kāma* properly and can also desist from sensual enjoyment when necessary ; But the man who indulges in sensual enjoyment for its own sake becomes a debauchee and can never experience *śānti* in his life. His mind is always burning with passions.

Further, we are advised by the sages of our country to perform our actions with full knowledge of the end which we wish to obtain. The end which we want to obtain is the development of human excellences in the forms of *ahimsā*, *satya*, *tyāga*, *saṁyama*, etc. If the members of a society act with full knowledge of these precious things of life, there will be no disorder in the society which will automatically become more and more integrated. Such is the social thought of India based on the metaphysical truth of *advitīya ātmavāda*. The socio-moral values, prescribed by the sages of India, are such that they are to be practised in every form of social life. Even the people of a state with a materialistic outlook will have to adhere to *satya*, *saṁyama*, etc. in all human dealings as otherwise, the state of their choice will not survive for a long time. It is due to this fact that India is regarded as the torchbearer of human civilisation. In the midst of the present day world crisis, it is, therefore, the imperative duty of every philosopher to bring to the notice of the world, these fundamental human values, the cultivation of which has become absolutely necessary for the preservation of world-peace.

PHILOSOPHY FOR A FULLER LIFE

Many faiths and philosophies have flourished in India with the common object of helping us to know what the significance of a full and perfect life really is. It was the firm belief of ancient Indian sages that the philosophy of Dharma based on the upanisadic spiritualism could enable one to enjoy fulness of life both from the worldly and the religious points of view.

Dharma is a term which embraces the life of an individual in all its aspects. Social duties, social virtues, moral excellences, laws, administration of socio-political institutions, the socio-political relations of different types, are all encompassed by Dharma. Enjoyment of material objects (artha), enjoyment of family happiness (kāma) and the enjoyment of peace emanating from self-realisation (mokṣa) are to be rooted in Dharma. Since the philosophy of Dharma is intimately related to social and moral life, this seems to be the one that can very well bring about an all round development of human life.

One who desires to attain fullness in the worldly sense can do so by grounding his worldly-life on the philosophy of Dharma. Indeed, the philosophy of Dharma is built on sound psychological and metaphysical foundation : it is out and out social in its value and meaning. Man has to live his life in a planned and organised manner, otherwise he will not be blessed with the glory of perfection. A haphazard growth of life can never make anybody's existence meaningful. Hence, the philosophy of Dharma urges a man to live a life of socio-moral virtues as well as of discipline so as to be able to enhance his own personal goodness. Brahmacharya or the celibate studentship is the stage when a man should learn the philosophy of Dharma. This philosophy bids everyone to understand in proper perspective his duties and responsibilities to others as well as to himself. He should be prepared to discharge them sincerely so as to be able to promote effectively the solidarity and enduring welfare of society.

Worldly Life

The householder who seeks to have fullness and perfection of the world, should follow strictly the code of morals, (Prescribed by the philosophy of Dharma), in all his social dealings. He should be eager to perform all his family duties and social duties in the best possible manner for the material and spiritual benefit of all including himself. The life of a man, to be successful in the worldly sense, should be grounded on satya, tyaga, samyama, Truth, Sacrifice, self-control, kartavya-bhāvanā (devotion to duties),. He should practise contentment because without contentment he will not be able to attain success in any activity. His heart should over-flow with the milk of love and sympathy as these are the qualities which lie at the root of family happiness and social peace. He should develop a liberal outlook and a spirit of toleration so as to be able to accommodate other's views and other's needs ; otherwise family life and social life will not be free from conflicts and chaos. He should also be particular about the preservation of his health and vigour so as to be able to remain active and energetic in social life. The philosophy of Dharma teaches a man to respect the world, to love all, to respect all, to give up the habit of hankering after the wealth or property of other people, to perform all social duties, to speak the truth, to live for a full hundred years by doing deeds so as to enable the society to prosper and produce more and more good for the benefit of its members. All these sociomoral duties and values are closely inter-linked with the highest value which is peace and spiritual perfection. The practice of Dharma with sincerity and selflessness will thus make a man good, noble and perfect.

The philosophy of Dharma, being based on upanisadic spiritualism, teaches a man to be ever ready to sacrifice his own good for the good of all. Since there is only one nondual consciousness and the individuals are only its various manifestations, there is no real difference between man and man. One should, therefore, build up his character by selfless activity in such a manner that he will not only be able to enjoy the

satisfaction of mind as a perfect citizen of the society, but will also be able to shine as a brilliant star on the horizon of the world. It is the beauty and bliss of *ātman* which is to be enjoyed in this world in and through all relations which exist between man and man and also between man and the world. One who succeeds in this respect, succeeds also in winning the best reward of the social life.

Fuller Life

When by following the philosophy of Dharma, a man will be able to attain perfection as a man, he will then be able to attain peace or liberation which is the highest good. Having completely discharged all social obligations and having acquired all social-moral excellences, a man becomes eager to taste the bliss of the Life Eternal. Here also, the philosophy of Dharma will help him to cross completely the floor of mundane existence. He will have to pass through a preparatory stage when he will have to follow the disciplines laid down by the Philosophy of Dharma. He should study the scriptures, reflect on them so as to make his mind free from doubts, he should cultivate a detached attitude to worldly enjoyment : he should practise karma-yoga as a form of spiritual *sādhana* ; he should make his mind free from all sorts of impure thoughts, feelings and emotions. His only aim should be to dedicate his whole life to the Life Divine. Such a soul will then be able to attain perfection in the true sense of the term. It is true that liberation is trans-empirical and trans-moral : but we should not forget that it is to be sought by remaining in a social order and by promoting social good. There is no gap between the empirical and the trans-empirical. The empirical life, if led thoughtfully and in accordance with the philosophy of Dharma, will find its spontaneous completion in the trans-empirical Divinity.

Indian philosophical attitude towards life centres round the idea that life is not to be spent wholly in irresponsible enjoyment of worldly pleasures. Permanent peace and perfection of life are not compatible with such enjoyment. Real happiness

(either in social life or in the spiritual life) emanates from the very nature of the soul. Hence, it is the enlightened and the spiritually perfected soul that can have a taste of the fullness of life and this goal can be achieved in the best possible manner by following the philosophy of Dharma.



RE-BIRTH AND KARMA

[The problem of re-birth and karma has been agitating the minds of wise people from time immemorial. Why are we born ? Where shall we go ? What is our fate after the death ? These are the basic queries of the human mind. The author of this article asserts that no scientific solution universally acceptable is possible in regard to this problem ; and so long as science cannot prove beyond doubt that consciousness is nothing but a product of physical elements, the belief in re-birth and karma cannot be wholly discarded.—Editor]

The law of karma and the theory of re-birth have been accepted as axiomatic truth by all systems of Indian Philosophy except the Cārvāka School. This is due to the fact that philosophers of this country (excepting Cārvākas) have always admitted that the spiritual being is the essential being of man. The shell of flesh and blood is only an artificial adjunct that gets attached to a soul due to avidyā karma. It is because of this shell that the individual soul appears as a worldly-being in a pitiable condition and goes through a process of birth and death, bondage and sufferings till it realises its own true nature and dissociates itself permanently from the psycho-physical organism which is either Māyika or Prākṛitika in nature. Indians in fact, believe in the evolution of the soul from ignorance to knowledge, from an inert condition (Jaḍakalpa) of existence to a fully illuminated state and this evolution needs re-incarnation, times without number. The spiritual life which is the Life Immortal does not supersede the natural life immediately as if by magic. This regeneration needs spiritual culture which cannot be completed in one birth. The unveiling of the immortal man, the birth of the spiritual from the psycho-physical is the true salvation and purpose of life and this purpose of life can be fulfilled only through the continuous efforts of different lives. The soul

which is nothing but pure consciousness, is eternal. It cannot die and cannot be born. It is always there at the background of the psycho-physical life.

There are, of course, differences of belief among different schools of Indian Philosophy regarding the journey of the soul between a death and a birth and also regarding the number and kinds of bodies and the processes of transmigration, still the idea of the continued identity of the soul through different migrations is common to all.

Some explain the *utkramaṇa* of the soul with the help of the non-physical *sukṣma śarīra* and *liṅga śarīra*. Some, again, do not introduce any kind of subtle body to explain the journey of the soul; but all the schools of thought believe that the soul must undergo numerous births, gathering experience from the different strata of life. This belief in re-birth has not, however, been adhered to dogmatically by the different schools of Indian Philosophy. They have collected evidences from life and have based the theory of re-birth on sound arguments. The following are the main arguments which have been put forward by different schools in favour of the theory of re-birth and karma :

(A) Even a newborn baby shows the instinct of sucking and fear of death which the baby has not experienced in this life. The instinctive urges (which are unlearned) are nothing but *samskāras* or impressions of previous lives. A new born baby is not an entirely new creation. It had its past lives when it had performed this action. Impressions are already stored up in its mind. So, as soon as the baby sees the mother's breast, this *samskāra* is immediately aroused and it helps the baby to preserve its life.

Indian Philosophers do not believe that human beings are born with blank minds on which nothing remains written. On the other hand, the belief, here, is this that an individual is

always born with *samskāras* which are nothing but accumulated thoughts of the past lives, in subtle forms. A man can easily understand all the things of the present life which fit in well with the predominating *samskāras* of his mind. This is why we often find that although the preceptor teaches the same thing to a number of his disciples, all are not capable of grasping the thing in the same manner. Everybody understands the problem in the light of the dominant *samskāras* of his mind. Prajāpati taught the same lesson to Indra and Virocana but they grasped it differently in accordance with the different *samskāras* of the mind. There is, then, the instinctive fear of death. The fear of death cannot be inherited from the parents because the children are born before the death of the parents. The fear of death, therefore, must be the experience of the individual and because the individual is still living, he must have acquired it in his previous lives.

(B) Following the upaniṣadic traditions all systems of Indian Philosophy, except the Cārvāka system, believe that bondage is due to karma. It is the mind in its impure state that leads us to perform action and thereby creates a snare of repeated existence for ourselves. The present life of a living individual is nothing but the inevitable consequence of his own accomplished efforts. The life of an ignorant man remains confined to the sphere of the law of karma and the realm of karma is nothing but the realm of re-birth.

The law of karma holds that every action in ordinary human-life springs from desire and results in impressions which become the seeds of future activities and desires. In other words, we can say that every action is followed by corresponding reaction and this law of action and reaction is called the law of karma or the law of cause and effect. So long as a man remains bound to this law of karma, he performs various activities and goes on weaving his own cobweb of birth and death.

The belief in the law of karma is necessary to explain inequalities of life. Persons, born of the same parents and

brought up in the same environment, attain different grades of success in life. Some are learned, some idiots ; some are happy, some miserable.

Moreover, we often find that persons who are doing vicious actions are rolling in wealth whereas persons who are scrupulously honest are living in extreme poverty. Are all these inequalities man-made and removable ? Sometimes we find that even though a person does not suffer from any ill of life, still he is not happy. He is so formed that inspite of his best efforts, he cannot enjoy anything. Even a psycho-analyst fails to cure many of his patients.

Why is it so ?

The ancient Indian Philosophers have tried to explain these apparent riddles of the expirical life with the help of the doctrine of karma and re-birth. Man is the maker of his own life. At every moment, he is creating his future life by means of his present actions. There is nothing like a fate or destiny making us happy or miserable inspite of ourselves. Our fate is nothing but the accumulated traces of our own avidya-karma. Since it is the karma that determines the kind of birth that an individual is going to have in the worldly condition of his existence, conceptions of the eternality of the soul, karma and re-birth are very closely connected. If one believes in the eternality of the soul or in the law of karma or in both, he has got to believe in the doctrine of re-birth. The law of karma holds that an individual has got to reap the fruits of his own karma ; but the fruits of all the actions which an individual does in a life are not enjoyed by him in that particular life. So, he has to come again again to reap the fruits of all his actions.

Vātsāyana has said in his commentary on sutra 4-1-10 :

“He for whom Rebirth consists of the birth of one entity and destruction of another entity would be faced with the absurdity that one entity would be deprived of the fruits of his deeds while another would be saddled with the fruits of acts not done by him”

(English translation : G. Jha.)

According to Vācaspati Misra, too, we have got to admit that re-incarnation takes place according to the law of karma. If the experiences of pleasures and pains do not depend on the actions of the past lives, then there is no sense in following the instructions of the scriptures. If an individual can enjoy happiness even without doing good actions in any of his lives, then why should he perform scriptural rites which can be done with great difficulty ?

We have already seen that according to Indian tradition, svarupolabdhi is the result of spiritual evolution or gradual progress. This is a sādhanā or spiritual culture which has got to be extended over many lives. In the state of ignorance, the individual remains in an inert condition (jāḍakalpa). He then remains interested merely in the body and its needs. All bodily needs are felt and controlled by biological propensities and the individual is incapable of feeling the presence of the soul in him. To get up from this sleep of ignorance and to feel that the individual in his real nature is something different from and superior to its physical covering, is not an easy task. But the goal of human life is to reach this stage. So, the individual has to struggle hard in different lives so as to be able to know fully what he really is.

It has been pointed out by the followers of Yoga-philosophy that yogins by concentrating on the impressions in this life can go backward to the experiences of their previous births. In this way, memories of the past lives can be revived. This super-normal act of the yogins proves conclusively the doctrine of re-birth.

(C) Man, as a moral agent, can never be satisfied if he is told that like unconscious stones and bricks, he, too, has originated from a combination of material particles and that his life, too, is guided merely by physical and chemical laws. Everybody finds satisfaction in the thought that his life is purposeful and that he has come here to fulfill some end of superior value. In fact, a human body cannot be compared with the unconscious body of a stone. There is an important point of

difference between the two. The stone does not emerge from the action of the germ cells but a human body does. Hence, what is true of a piece of stone cannot be true of the human being.

This, in brief, is the Indian view of karma and re-birth. Now, let us discuss some of the objections which are generally advanced against this theory.

Objections

The modern science of psychology teaches that instincts are not the traces of the individual's own experiences of the past lives ; rather, they are the inherited dispositions or racial habits which prompt the possessor to behave in certain specific ways in relation to certain specific objects. These instincts undergo changes along with the progressive changes of a particular race. They become well-differentiated and more in number because the original ones gradually send out more and more branches. Hence, instincts are really products of evolution and they can be satisfactorily explained by heredity and evolution without the help of the theory of re-incarnation. The instincts of the successors are the habits of their predecessors and not of their own making. In successive generations, the tendency to acquire the useful habit of the prior generations becomes stronger and stronger and finally the habit will not have to be learnt at all. Certain brain structures will also be formed accordingly and will be passed on from generation to generation.

According to some critics, the fear of death is not instinctive and it does not establish the theory of re-birth. No body is willing to lose any of his belongings because the pleasure and happiness of his life depends on them. The desire to enjoy pleasure is a natural desire. Just as dresses, house, wealth etc. are the upakaraṇas of a man's pleasure, in the same manner his body is his bhogāyatana. Without the body, one is not in a position to enjoy the pleasures of his life. It is no wonder that since worldly-pleasure is valued so much, the fear of losing it due to death or destruction of the body is expressed so prominently in the life of a man.

Further, a belief in karma and re-birth is not necessary to explain the unequal distribution of happiness and sorrow and the differences in temperament, tendencies and inclinations. Persons born of the same parents differ in tendencies and inclinations due to environmental differences. No two children born in different years enjoy the same environmental influences.

Moreover, the law of Nature is to produce variety and multiplicity. It is *svabhāva* of *Prakṛti* that there should be differences in Nature, that there should be differences in man.

Lastly, the theory of origin of life which has been established by biological science does not agree with the theory of re-birth. According to the science of biology, reproduction in the sphere of living beings, takes place in two ways (1) sexually and (2) asexually.

In the case of No. 1, a new life is produced when a sperm from the male body fuses its chromosomes with those in the mature egg-cell of the female body. Due to fusion, the hereditary material of the offspring is formed by the hereditary materials contributed by two parents. (Transmission of acquired characteristics is a controversial issue).

In the case of No. 2, the living being divides into two or splits itself into different pieces. Here, the new living being has the same chromosome material as that of its single parent.

In both the cases, however, the body of offspring is formed by the division of cells. Since, the germ-cell contains all the material in its structures called chromosomes, one may be inclined to think that the germ-cell is the *jīva*. But this cannot be the Indian view because according to Indian view, *jīva* is indivisible whereas the germ-cell of the body undergoes divisions.

“The alternative hypothesis of a disembodied soul entering into the cell at every instance of cellular division is quite unnecessary by the fact that the dividing parts were already instinct with life”. (Swami Iśvarananda : Does the soul reincarnate ?)

In the case of sexual reproduction, a single parent is giving birth to its offspring by dividing itself into parts. If a star-fish is divided into parts, then each part develops a new individual by growing automatically new arms and limbs. How are we to explain this type of origination with the theory of re-birth and karma ? The soul of the parent star-fish cannot be divided into parts. Nor can we say that a subtle body attached to a new soul was waiting to enter into the offspring star-fish. This is because the part which became the offspring was alive even when the division was taking place.

Regarding *yogaja jnana* it can be said that these experiences have not been scientifically proved as yet. So, the fact that a yogin can know the facts of his past lives by means of *sam̐yama* is still a miracle and is not widely accepted. The fact that has not been proved conclusively as yet cannot be advanced as proving a hypothesis.

Objections met

All these objections, no doubt, provide us with good material for thought. Before we proceed to solve these difficulties, we should make an attempt to understand clearly the natures of the subtle-body, the *jīva* and the *soul*.

By soul, we mean nothing else but illuminating consciousness. To say that the soul is deathless is nothing but to hold that the negation of consciousness can never be thought of. This is because *caitanya* (negation of consciousness) can be conceived of only with the help of *caitanya*. Pure self-revealing consciousness has no origination or decay, no birth or death. So the question of rebirth does not arise in regard to pure consciousness which is beyond the sphere of karmic influences. Who, then, undergoes the processes of birth and death ? It is the worldly soul which is a mixed category of *cit* and *acit* that falls in the snare of karma and moves round the cycle of birth and death. *Jīva* is consciousness qualified by *antaḥkaraṇa* or consciousness reflected in *antaḥkaraṇa*. The *antaḥkaraṇa* portion of the *jīva* is *acit* and this *acit* portion of the *jīva* can possess three different states. (1) The unconscious state of the *antaḥkaraṇa* contains

vāsanās and saṃskāras of the previous lives in subtle forms. (II) The conscious state which is created at every moment by our perceptions, inference etc., (III) The super conscious state when the mind becomes steady and pure and is in a position to know the past, present and the future and also the subtle and the gross. Ordinarily the conscious state is influenced by the unconscious one and the knowledge that arises in the conscious level is always limited in nature. In Western Psychology, instincts have been described as racial habits but in India all these urges are regarded as the individual's own habits of thought and action of the past lives.

Life-stream is flowing in innumerable currents and each one of these currents is undergoing expansion and contraction ; when a particular current contracts, its gross cover falls off and when it again expands it does so with the help of a fresh cover. Light remains in a very subtle form in the subtle wires of electricity. In this state, the light is not visible to us. Light is, however, manifested when a bulb is used. Antaḥkaraṇa too is formed of a very subtle stuff. So, the activities which are taking place in the antaḥkaraṇa are also very subtle. So, these subtle activities need a gross physical body to get manifested. This gross body is formed of the germ-cells.

The germ-cell cannot be regarded as the soul because the germ-cell is constantly undergoing changes whereas pure consciousness is unchangeable. The germ-cell is, in fact, the upādhi of consciousness. The body which is composed of the germ-cells contains not only the so-called inherited dispositions, but it also contains consciousness. The germ-cells cannot make up the personality of a person unless they are imbued with consciousness. Let us admit that the so-called saṃskāras are nothing but the hereditary materials inherited either from the parents or from the race; but the question still remains : where does the consciousness come from ? Does the consciousness of parents split up and enter into the body of the offspring ? This cannot be, because consciousness is indivisible. If the whole of the consciousness of parents enter into the body of the

offspring, then the parents will cease to have consciousness which is never the case. So, the body of the offspring is imbued with consciousness from some other source. In other words, the body of the offspring gets associated with a different consciousness (i. e., with a different soul). If this is so, then the theory of re-birth is virtually accepted. Science has admitted that the germ-cell contains hereditary material. According to some schools of Indian Philosophy, non-physical samskāras of the citta remain in a subtle cover composed of the subtle tanmātras. This subtle cover is known as the subtle body. The gross body formed of the germ-cells helps the subtle body to work.

The subtle body and the samskāras contained therein are the changeable and movable acidamśa of the jiva. It is this unconscious portion that actually passes from life to life getting associated with different gross bodies. The subtle body is devoid of gross materiality (Sthūla-bhautikatva) as it is not covered by annamaya kosha. The subtle physical elements or tanmātras which make up the subtle body are less solidified. The tanmātras which are āhamkārika in nature are capable of movement. The organs, etc., which remain in the subtle body remain merged in the limga. When a man dies, his thought energy in the form of samskāras do not get scattered in space; but this energy remains stored up in the subtle body. Of these samskāras, those which are in a position to find expression in a different personality enter into the sperm of that person who possesses like tendencies. So long as the sperms remain in the body of the father, they remain enlivened by his consciousness; but when they come out of the body of the father, they lose connection with the consciousness of the father. In that case the sperm that has become associated with a subtle body and consequently with a soul acquires potency to fertilise the egg-cell of the mother's body. The remaining sperms being dissociated from the consciousness of the father die immediately. The fertilised egg-cell, then, gradually transforms itself into the form of a human body.

The subtle body which is an intermediary structure between the soul and the gross body is a sheath of energy. So, as energy, it is capable of entering into the body of a human being.

The Nyāya-system has not accepted the subtle body as the intermediary between the soul and the gross body. According to this school, it is the atomic mind of the *jīva* that passes from life to life. The *samskāras* and *vāsanās* remain stored up in the bound-soul. It is the mind that enters into the sperm of the father and creates the *bhogayatana* of the particular *jiva* associated with it.

The hereditary tendencies cannot explain the " why " of the birth of man (why is a man born in a particular environment ?) This " why " becomes intelligible to us only when we believe that a man is born in a particular setting because he has to reap the fruits of his actions of previous lives. In other words it is the law of karma that can give at least a satisfactory explanation regarding the *why* of the origin of life.

In the case of the star-fish too, it can be said that its body is the upādhi of its consciousness. To become many from the division of one individual is the process of reproduction adopted by Nature in the case of such animals. Here also, each part will become associated with a subtle body which is fit to work through it.

Again, to say that variety is the law of nature is not enough. If we say that all combinations of different things and consequent production of multiplicity is taking place as a matter of course (*svabhāva-vāda*), then there will remain no scope for human initiative and action. Nature, is automatically bringing about changes. The individual will not have to work hard to gain knowledge. Crops will grow by natural powers inherent in the seeds. Farmers will not have to do anything to raise crops.

We cannot of course, deny the influence of the environment. Children generally form their conduct by imitating the thoughts and actions of the older members of their family. Still the difficulty is not solved. The question may still be asked : why does the environment change in a manner which brings about definite changes in the structures and behaviours of two

children, though parents try their level best to keep the environment same for them ? So long as this *why* is not explained fully in terms of purely physical conditions, we shall have to believe in the law of karma and re-birth. To say simply that change is the law of nature is not enough. We must find out the creative force that inspires Nature to undergo changes in various ways and we must also prove that this creative force is purely physical and non-mental in nature and origin.

It is a fact that we are incapable of knowing the mystical experiences of the *yogins* ; because these experiences take place in the super-conscious state of the mind. We cannot know directly the experiences of ordinary minds also. The mind of A works in a way which is different from that of B. Still, when B says that he is having such and such experiences in his mind, A readily accepts them although A cannot perceive directly B's mental states. (A may not even know that such states can arise in the mind of a man.) Then, why should we hesitate to accept the reports of the *yogins* who have reached a super normal state of experience which is entirely different from the normal mental state ? Why should we expect that we should be able to test the validity of yogic knowledge with the perverted structure of our ordinary mind ?

In fact, the problem of re-birth and karma is a very old one, the solution of which has been disturbing the minds of the wise people from time immemorial. The questions,—“Why are we born ? Where shall we go ? What is our fate after death ?—are the basic queries of a human-mind. These were the questions which disturbed the mind of Naciketas who wanted to have their solutions from the God of Death.

Truly speaking, these questions can be solved only individually by one's own thinking in accordance with his own temperament and inclinations. No scientific solution, universally acceptable is possible in regard to this problem ; but so long as science cannot prove beyond doubt that consciousness is nothing but a product of physical elements, the belief in re-birth and karma cannot be wholly disregarded.

THE VEDIC AGE : ITS HUMANISTIC APPROACH

The period extending from about 2000 B. C. to 600 B. C. is generally known as the Vedic period. During this period, the Mantras, the Brahmanas and the Upaniṣads were composed. The history of Brahmanical religion can rightly be supposed to begin with the hymns of the Rig Veda. From the historical evidence gathered so far, it appears that the Aryan people of the age were not recluses who used to live away from all material and human concerns : on the other hand, they were primarily engaged in the search for the ways and means by which they could increase their physical, material and moral well being. They did not separate the real from the mundane life and existence. It was primarily the human interest that had driven them to propitiate nature-gods. They were no less eager to unlock the secrets of the universe than the people of the modern age; and this also they wanted to do not for the attainment of liberation but for deriving human usefulness from natural phenomena. The only drawback noticed in their case was the lack of scientific and rational method of approach. They were eager to control natural phenomena by winning the grace of their presiding deities through prayers and chanting of mantrās. The prayers which were offered unto various gods were primarily intended for worldly things such as riches, cattle, children and the like. Life of these Aryan people was simple, fresh and full of hopes and expectations for worldly happiness. They were not at all gloomy or pessimistic. Life was a good thing for them and they were out in the world to enjoy life to its full brim. It was this passionate love for both life and material prosperity which had actually encouraged them to face the non-aryans of the Indus Valley who were beyond doubt, more advanced in culture and civilisation. They also wanted to exploit fully natural phenomena for their needs but it was beyond their power to bring Nature under their control. So, nature-gods were imagined and were believed to be of

superior powers exercising living influences on the social life of the vedic people. The sages, who were the leaders of the society, had disclosed through their prayers the way of pleasing these gods so that they might bestow wealth and prosperity on the vedic people. This was, how various gods like Indra, Varuna, Surya, etc., appeared on the horizon of the vedic life and started exercising powerful influences on the day-to-day life of the aryan people. They prayed to God for help in all the situations of life including victory in the battles with the non-aryans. In the Rg Veda, for example, the sage has uttered :

*“The evil doing dasyu is around us, senseless
keeping false laws, inhuman ;
Oh ! Slayer of enemies, batter
the weapon of the dasas.*

(Rg. Veda—X—22)

The hymns of the Rg. Veda also reveal that these Aryans had the feeling that they should not live in this world if they were not provided with various sorts of worldly enjoyments. They also assumed the responsibility for improving the conditions of their lives both individually and collectively. There are many hymns in which gods were propitiated to bestow all good things on the Aryans as a tribe or community. Asvins, for example, were requested earnestly to bring wealth and prosperity to all the Aryans (Rg. Veda 1.47). The Dawn was, again, invoked to give the Aryans, residential houses, cows, corns, etc. She was also requested to kill the enemies of the Aryan people. (Rg. Veda 1.48). Whenever the sages wanted to have some good things of life, they had expressed their sincere desires to share those things with all the members of the tribe. Such an attitude was definitely humanistic.

This humanistic tendency seemed to be the outcome of the primitive collective life of the Aryan people, the faint currents of which could be traced even through all the subsequent stages of the evolution of the Aryan society. The Aryan people had always displayed a community feeling based on spiritual unity. An individual was always viewed as an individual belonging to

a particular community and it was the good of the community that used to get preference over individual concerns. Collective enjoyment of happiness seemed to have been the goal of the social life of the Aryan people.

Again, adoration of all human excellences with a sincere desire to imbibe them is another element of humanism displayed by the thought and culture of the vedic people. Godheads were believed to be the diverse manifestations of a supreme power, behind and above, controlling and moving all objects and phenomena. The supreme purpose of life in their opinion should, therefore, be to grow into higher varieties of spiritual existence. Indeed, it was the journey of the vedic seers up the hill of their true being that had found finest expression in and through these hymns and prayers. The vedic sages did not utter the mantras to please the Supreme God or gods (who were supposed to be His various manifestations) for personal pleasures only : on the other hand, he was declaring that one should seek to know the Supreme God without which Rk Mantras would be of no use to him. To see truth and to know truth is the privilege only of man. Hence, to attain the greatness of manhood, one should seek to enrich mind with the knowledge of the highest and the best; because the spiritual progress is the only thing that can make him immortal. So, it can be reasonably said that the seed of humanism in the form of realisation of the excellences of human-life was definitely present in the dim past of the vedic age.

Human aspiration to rise to the higher level of existence by getting rid of all the impurities of his soul through divine grace has repeatedly found expression through the Rg. Veda.

"Oh Agni, illuminator of darkness, day by day we approach you with holy thought bringing homage to you."

"If we, Oh Varuna, have offended against a friend, or if we have offended against an all-time comrade or a brother or an inmate—whether belonging to us, Oh Varuna, or a stranger,—do you remove that offence from us."

Yajurveda : In the Yajurveda also, we find the same humanistic outlook.

Yajurveda : Chapter I, No. 3—"May he purify us through the store of true knowledge and all sciences contained in the Vedas elevating selfless deeds."

Yajurveda : Chapter I, No. 9—"Oh ye men, increase the store of goods acquired by honest and fair means to be used in the service of humanity. May your life be constantly dedicated to this principle. May the spiritually minded people also not give up this humanitarian work."

Yajurveda : Chapter I, No. 11 : "I resort to agriculture and craft for removing poverty and ministering happiness to all."

These passages clearly prove that the vedic ritualistic performances were not merely mechanical but were also of great social and ethical value.

Humanism : its spiritual basis

The Rg. vedic sages have supposed human life to be rooted not in its finite manifestation but in the infinite being of the soul or ātman. It is due to this spiritualistic attitude to life that in ancient India, the worldly life has never been wholly divorced from the sacred. To be endowed with human excellences was the goal of the social life because such a perfected personality alone can find his final refuge in the great spiritual harmony of the world. So, the principle of Rta or dharma was supposed to embrace life in all aspects. Both the physical and the religio-moral worlds were supposed to be governed by the principle of Rta. In the moral world, the principle was deemed to find its expression in the sense of justice which was to be concretised and actualised in and through social relations. Human life in the society was a replica of the heavenly life. So, there should be harmony and concord, justice, and fair dealings on the earth also. These people used to think that there were not only indissoluble bonds between man and man but there was also an intimate relation between man and the great spiritual force behind and beyond the universe. Both

heaven and earth were supposed to be the component notes of the great Spiritual Harmony which was looked upon as both transcendent to and immanent in finite life and the universe.

These people seem to believe that human life does not possess bio-social dimension only; it seems to have a transcendent dimension of spirituality as well. So, bio-social values are to be harmoniously blended with spiritual values so as to enable a man to attain his completeness as a spiritual being smoothly and spontaneously without any break. Values are indeed the effluent glow that streams out from the heart of a perfect harmony—a harmony that finds expression in the *Rta* or *Satya* that reigns supreme in the physical, the moral and the religious spheres. In the religious sphere, *Rta* used to refer to sacrifices or rites. The eternal harmony or order implied by *Rta* must be respected even by the immortal gods. It was *Rta* which was supposed to remove all physical and moral impurities of human minds and also to bless them with the elixir of humanity. It was this conception of a single unifying spiritual principle as the source and support of all living beings that had formed the corner stone of the humanitarian sentiment of the vedic people.

From the historical evidences collected so far, it seems to us that such a conception started gaining ground in Indian soil when the Aryans had settled down in this country after defeating completely the non-Aryans. In the initial tribal state of the social life, the Aryans seemed to believe that all members of a tribe had descended from a common stock and that all of them should be supposed to share a common life and a common existence. Such a view might have given rise to a monotheistic or monistic outlook which seemed to form the kernel of the overt polytheism of the vedic religion. It was the vision of oneness of the tribal life emanating from the bosom of some spiritual reality which had become the perennial source of the humanistic sentiments of the vedic religion. It was

this living humanism which had actually succeeded in saturating the Indian life of the vedic age with sweetness and sympathy.

In the vedic age, the main desire of man was to realise the vastness and magnanimity of the soul by completely identifying himself with his own social group. The individual was, thus, regarded merely as a functioning component of social organisation. He was seen in the social context and never as isolated individual. Personal tendencies were not to be cultivated and self-assertive individuality was not to be developed, because they could realise that humanity consisted in the full development of the vision of oneness based on the finer sentiments of love, friendship and spiritual freedom. The tribal solidarity was very important and an individual could not have any worthy existence if he was ousted from the clan. To live together, sharing a common life was the motto of the vaidika people. Land was commonly cultivated under common ownership and all social, economic and religious functions also used to be performed on a common basis.

—Rg. Veda-1.5., 1.9.

Materialism: not the keynote:

It is incorrect to suppose that the humanism of the vedic people was an offshoot of a materialistic outlook on life. It is true that these people were interested in the material prosperity and material gain but the hedonistic tone which echoed through the prayers of the sages was not wedded to a materialistic conception of the world. In spite of their hankering after material gain and material prosperity, these people always gave expression to a deep faith in the spiritual reality and also in the unchangeable nature of the moral law. "The rivers stream forth right, the sun shines for the truth. . . . and the path of the ancient gods in heaven is not to be transgressed." (Rg. Veda-105, 5). Such a faith is opposed to materialism. The vedic sages wanted to be in affectionate bond with the gods ; they also longed to remain the worshippers of gods as passionately and sincerely as is usual with every theist of the modern age. The distinction is noticeable only in the fact that a theist of the present day seeks the grace

of God to attain his spiritual perfection whereas these people sought the grace of gods for attaining both worldly happiness and mental purity. The passionate desire of the worshipper to be in intimate relation with his beloved god is also met with in the vedic hymns.

“All my thoughts seeking happiness extol Indra, longing for him ; they embrace him as wives embrace a fair young bridegroom, him, the divine giver of gifts, that he may help me ! My mind is directed to Indra and does not turn from thee; On thee, I rest my desire, Oh ! much invoked one.” (Rg Veda-10, 43). The mutual relation between God and the devotee is a characteristic of theism and not of materialism. All through the hymns of the Rg. Veda, it is evident that the sages were guided principally by the glow of a natural intuition (*Sahaja prajñā*) of the eternal spirit and which was the real source of their mystic utterings. The mystic spirit not only suffused the natural phenomena but it also moistened the thoughts and feelings of the vedic people. It is evident from the Rg. vedic hymns that the vedic people were not satisfied with what was presented to them as mere sights and sounds, colours and smells : they did make sincere efforts to feel in them the presence of some mystic spirit which was the life-giving principle behind and beyond the phenomenal show. The principle was infused with the glow of a supraphysical light. They felt as if they were living in the midst of mystic influences which were guiding them in all phases of worldly existence and this feeling was expressed through all the mantras which had for that reason become the vehicles to lead them agreeably to spiritual power and truth. It was because the texture of the life of the vedic people was woven with the multi-coloured hue of a rich and infinite spiritual being that the vibrating notes of humanism could be found in abundance in the social life of India through all its various stages of evolution.

Upaniṣadic Age (700 B.C. to 600 B.C.)

Coming to the age of the upaniṣads, we find that according to the upaniṣadic thinkers also, there can be no true brahmahood

unless it is based on the cultivation of humanistic morality. The humanism of this period was to end in the mystic experience of the oneness of all which was the final goal and end of the life of man. Human good does not lie in pure material enjoyment nor does it lie in rigid ascetic spirituality. Material well being must be linked with spiritual well-being of man. In fact, it is detachment (born of spiritual perfection) and not intense involvement in material pleasures that enables a man to enjoy the world in a rational and human way. In the Brh. upaniṣad we find Yājña Valkya desiring both spiritual perfection and material well-being. (Brh IV, 1.1 & 1.7)

The Taittirīya upaniṣad has overtly acknowledged the intimate relationship between the material prosperity and spiritual well-being of man. (Taittirīya-11.8). Secular life is not to be divorced from the sacred life of the spirit: on the other hand, the secular life is to be linked with the sacred life, if man sincerely wishes to attain moral and spiritual perfection. Man should love man as an end and not as a means to his own happiness. This is because the love that one bears to another is only the reflection of that Great Love which is the Ātman. One and the same reality is manifesting itself in innumerable forms of the living beings. So, all of them have equal value and equal significance in the scheme of the Life eternal. The strings of a musical instrument are different in size and thickness : but all of them are equally necessary to produce a perfect harmony of sounds. Taittirīya upaniṣad has again and again instructed human beings to practise humanity as a cardinal virtue of human life. Man is to be humanised and his material needs and desires are to be saturated by the never-ending light of the Ātman so that human nature may receive orderly direction and harmonious development even in the midst of his social relations.

Now, it was because of such an outlook that even with the introduction of the Varna system which was a system of division of the society into higher and lower classes and also of keeping the lowest class in a state of subjugation and slavery,

the wise men of India were not inhumanly cruel in prescribing rules for regulating the social life of the *Dasas* and the *Sudras*. The cruel treatment which the Greek slaves had received in the hands of their Roman conquerors was inconceivable in India. The defeated people of America, Africa and Australia were rooted out by the Europeans who happened to be the winners of the battles. The Aryans, in India, on the contrary, were liberal enough to include the defeated non-Aryans in their social fold, of course with some restrictions on their powers and privileges. It is true that the tribal system with its collective life and primitive communism was never wholly rooted out from India at any period of its social history ; even then, it seems to us that it was the awareness of the spiritual oneness of all which had actually shed the light of humanism in the socio-political thoughts of Indian people, in the age of the *vedas* and the *upanişads*.

HUMANISTIC APPROACH OF THE DHARMASUTRAS AND THE EPICS

[In the earlier article under "The Vedic Age : Its Humanistic Approach" the author dealt with the Vedas and the Upaniṣads in a brief manner so as to bring out the elements of humanism involved in all their teachings. In the present article, the author discusses briefly the humanistic approach of the Dharmasutras—the Sacred Books—and the epics of ancient India—the Mahabharata and the Ramayana—Editor.]

The Dharma sūtras or the Sacred Law-books of Ancient India are chiefly concerned with social usages and customs of everyday life of the people. The common impression that these law books are inhumanly cruel towards the slaves or the dasas, is not correct. Let us discuss here the views of some of the noted law-givers of ancient India.

As we all know, Manu occupies a unique position in the socio-political life of Indian people. He is regarded as the father of mankind. Manu is credited with the promulgation of such rules of conduct which were essential for ensuring the stability and progress of the social life of the people of that age. A significant item of our social life is Varna Vibhāga (class-division) which is still exerting an undesirable influence on the social behaviour of our country men.

Origin of Varna System

The origin of Varna has been stated in many philosophical literatures of ancient and mediaeval India. The most well-known source of Varna is, however, the Purusha Sukta of the Rg. veda, in which the Great Purusha is said to have produced the entire universe including the four classes of people—Brahmins, the Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. According to Manu the purpose of the creation of four Varnas was the progress of the world. (Manu Samhita 1-31).

This shows that according to Manu, human societies were the necessary institutions through the influences of which alone, individuality could develop in a proper manner. Both the individual and the society should be understood in inter-relation with one another and an individual should never be set above the social organisation to which he belongs. The institution of four Varnas or the division of the society into four classes of people was then supposed to be the best form of social organization to further human progress and human perfection. The concept of equality of rights and privileges was not accepted as the basis of society because they could not find equality in Prakriti or Nature. Two men exactly equal in all respects (i. e. physically, morally and spiritually) are not normally found in Nature. In fact Nature is multicoloured or diverse. Men are different, their needs are different, their physical, moral and intellectual capacities too are different.

Varnavibhāga as stated earlier, was a social plan of the period which might be regarded as an outcome of a developed concept of humanity. By this system, individuals of various capacities could get equal opportunities to show their inherent powers in different spheres of life. This was, indeed, a harmony of multicoloured personalities in a social unit. The class of a man used to be the indicator of his temperament and spiritual attainments. It seems to us that it is not correct to say that it was malice or hatred towards the *dasas* or *shudras* which had motivated such a division of the Aryan society. On the other hand the wise men of the age, perhaps wanted to establish a harmonious and stable society by making economists, politicians, traders, soldiers, servants and the priests to accept willingly their respective obligations to the society. All work was looked upon as socially useful and economically significant.

According to the law-givers of the age, the society was under an obligation to give its members appropriate scope to develop the natural capacities without being interfered with by others. Their humanitarian outlook inspired them to accept such a scheme of social life in which a right man could

always be found for the right position in both professional and religious spheres. This class division also used to limit the fantastic aspirations and unlimited greed of the individuals. Pleasures of the worldly life were to be enjoyed according to the inherent capacities of human beings. "Each according to his capacity" seemed to be the motto of these wisemen in regard to the distribution of the material wealth of the society. A man should enjoy fame, prosperity and power according to the quality of his character. Material well-being was not the final goal of a human life : the final goal was spiritual perfection. The more perfect the man was the greater was his right to hold a superior position in the society. This seemed to us to be the underlying spirit of the class-division of the society.

Inheritance or Sanskaras

It is true that Varna was ordinarily determined by birth. This was due to the fact that according to Indian tradition human beings were never believed to be born with blank minds on which nothing remained written. On the other hand, human beings were supposed to be born with Sanskāras (impressions) which were nothing but the accumulated feelings, thoughts, and desires of the past lives in subtle forms. Hence, the members of a particular class were supposed to be born with such Sanskāras which would make them specially suitable for the work assigned to that particular class. Even today, we believe in inherited capacities of human beings. Varnas were, however, flexible. A member of the lower rank could be admitted to a higher rank if he could acquire capacities and excellences of character prescribed for it. This also confirms the inherently humanistic nature of the social approach of these thinkers. The class-division was not, originally, an intolerance : on the other hand it was meant to establish a truly democratic society in which each member would get appropriate scope to develop his own inherited skill and capacities in the best possible manner.

It was in the dark age of Indian History that this system had degenerated into an instrument to oppress the lower castes. It

is true that according to Manu, the main duty of a Shudra was to serve the Brahmin householders, but these Brahmins were required to be learned and virtuous. Such a duty was assigned to the dasas and the Shudras who (in all probability) were not the followers of the Vaidika scriptures. Ajājnika Shudras, who spoke a different language, were thought suitable not for the performance of the Vaidika sacrifices but for rendering the menial services. The Aryans did not kill these strangers whom they had defeated but they had been assigned some social duties and had thus been considered useful members of the Aryan society. Although the Shudras were conscripted for household services of the upper classes, specially of the Brahmins, still the humanistic outlook of the law-giver had inspired him to make it obligatory on his master to provide them with the necessary comforts of life. The master was under a sacred obligation to satisfy all the essential needs of his Shudra servant.

Gautama

The same humanitarian outlook can be discovered in the Gautama-Dharma-sutra as well. Gautama too made it a duty of the master to provide his servants with his used shoes, umbrellas, garment, etc. In the present age, no doubt, such facilities are generally provided by masters for their servants; but instances are not rare where masters are not so sympathetic in this regard. It is noticeable that in that far off age, Gautam could think of the persons in menial service with such human sympathy and human consideration.

The Shudras, too, were advised to follow the path of truthfulness and purity. They were also asked to perform religious rites for celebrating the birth of the child etc. The lawgivers of the age were eager to ensure the peace and happiness of the lower classes also in their family-life, religious-life and moral-life. The lawbook of Gautam declares : "The Shudra shall also offer the funeral oblation. He should live with his wife only; and serve the higher castes. From them, he shall seek to obtain his livelihood. And the Arya under whose protection, he places himself must support him if he becomes unable to work."

No man was used in ancient India merely as a means to another person's happiness. Every man was supposed to be the spark of the Divine Light and so he should be treated as such. The master who was receiving service from a lower class man, should never forget that he was under an obligation to look after the physical, moral and spiritual well-being of his servant.

Mankind as a whole is marching towards spiritual freedom and the social life is just a stepping stone to that higher life of the spirit. Moral excellences which constitute the essence of humanism blossom into human hearts in and through various social relations which knit together the lives of different persons into one whole. It is needless to say that if we are to reach the goal of spiritual freedom, then it should be our foremost duty to purify our minds by acquiring human excellences through humanised social relations. The wisemen of ancient India were never oblivious of this cardinal truth of Jiva-hood and so they had never minimised the significance of life in any of its forms.

It is true that the slave was not allowed to make independent property of his own but he had full right over affectionate gifts which he used to receive from time to time from the master's family. A slave could also part with animals which he had received as affectionate gifts from other persons. Cases were not rare when masters of their own accord used to liberate even the hereditary slaves. Thus, even in the slave-owning State of Indian society, slaves were looked upon as human beings and were never treated like lower animals. It is true that the Shudras and slaves used to enjoy limited social privileges and rights and had to court more severe punishment in cases of transgression of socio-political laws than the upper classes. Side by side, it is also true that they were never deprived of all privileges and rights of man and were not degraded to the status of lower animals. They were never forced to fight with wild animals as was the case with the Greek slaves at ancient Roman shows. The Aryans were liberal enough to allow the Shudras a place in the scheme of their social life and had not made any unkind attempt

to wipe them out from the face of the earth. It was their humanistic approach to life, based on the spiritual oneness of all living beings, that had paved the way for a harmonious and comparatively peaceful integration between the Aryan and the non-Aryan cultures and also to accord the non-Aryans, certain human rights and privileges so as to enable them to live and enjoy certain amount of creature comforts of life in a peaceful social environment.

Epics of Ancient India

In the Mahabharata, we find that a humanitarian outlook based on the fundamental unity of spirit, had added a refined and delicate glow to all human deliberations and human thinking. The wise men of the age were mainly concerned with bringing about unity in a vast mass of multicoloured and multilingual races with different cultural levels. It was in the epic period that the temple worship and image worship gained so much prominence that sacrifices and sacrificial altars had to suffer loss of prestige and position in the life of the Vedic people. The very fact that the non-Aryan deities were placed on a footing of equality with the Aryan gods proves that the Aryans were not inhumanly hostile towards the non-Aryans. It was their human sympathy and wider vision of human life that inspired them to harmonise their own culture with the culture of the defeated non-Aryan people who were strangers to them both in regard to language and the pattern of living. The Mahabharata has been given the status of the Dharma Sastra and as such it deals with various aspects of social life knitted together by the indissoluble tie of the feeling of oneness of the spirit, a feeling that has the seed of humanism impregnated in it.

The Ramayana too has beautifully humanised the different kinds of relations which exist between man and man. It is because of this human sympathy that the sages of India have always advised us to practise detachment and not to get too much involved in personal pleasures and enjoyment. If we are concerned too much with our own profit and loss, then we shall never be able to work for the good of other human beings. We

shall never be able to assume responsibility for the life of mankind as a whole. We shall remain stuck to the net of our own narrow egoistic happiness and shall never be able to appreciate and feel the beauty of the vast encompassing life which is revealing itself at every moment through multiple colours and forms. It is only by standing outside of the narrow circle of his own egoistic existence that a man can really appreciate the beauty of life, can taste the immortal nectar that streams out in abundance from the innermost core of life and can also add flavour to human existence by his own selfless humanitarian services. There is no doubt that spiritual humanism can make a place for the sublime, the beautiful and the good even in a complex social set up by adding the new dimension of spirituality to existence.

Spiritual humanism

It is possible to catch a glimpse of such spiritual humanism in Chapter 60 of the Shanti Parva of the Mahabharata where we find Yudhishthira asking Bhishma the following questions :

“Raja kena Vivardhate


Kena paurashca bhrityashca

Vardhante Bharatarshabho”.

In other words, Bhishma was requested to explain how a king could attain his own material progress along with the material well-being of all his subjects including the dasas or the shudras. Incidentally in the history of the West, we hardly find an instance in which the king was seriously thinking of the material well-being of his slaves.

In ancient India, the social scheme, usages, customs and the rules of conduct were framed in such a manner that any intelligent and prudent king could realise that he would not be able to stabilise himself merely by increasing his military power; he would also have to look after the well-being of all his subjects, —a duty which was to be given the top priority by the king. The Mahabharata has repeatedly asserted that the essentially human qualities like truthfulness, non-anger, compassion willingness to share the material output of the land, living

with all members, friendliness, etc. should be cultivated by the men of all the varnas. It was their conviction that humanitarian relations between man and man could not be preserved in society unless all members were morally high. If any section of the society was allowed to live the life of lower animals then they would surely drag down the upper classes by their ill-will and hatred. Just as right man for the right job was supposed to be absolutely necessary, in the same manner awakening of humanitarian qualities also was regarded as necessary for proper upkeep of the socio-political life. It was because of this feeling that the law-givers of ancient age had given us the forms of Varnashrama dharmas and Sadharana dharmas and not a charter of human rights.



CARVAKAS : WHAT THEY STOOD FOR ?

Carvakas are generally grouped as a class of materialistic thinkers of ancient India who participated in a new movement of thought which started in the Upaniṣadic period. This new movement was actually directed against the hereditary priesthood and Brahmanic orthodoxy. Naturally, therefore, the leaders of this movement were not members of the Brahmanical tradition, based mainly on the Karma Kanda of the Vedas.

The torch-bearers of the New Movement did not accept the authority of the Vedas : in fact they were bold to declare that the entire Brahmanical system was nothing but a fraud. They declared their faith and confidence in their own efforts and intellect. They also believed sincerely that they would be able to find out (without Super-natural assistance) the real secret of human happiness. It is perhaps not incorrect to say that the builders of this new movement had the outlook of a rationalistic philosophy. The adherents of this movement used to be called *Sramanas* as opposed to Brahmanas.

Teachings of the Carvakas : A Sramana Group

If we study in details, the origin and growth of the *Sramana* movement of ancient India, we shall find that it had great philosophical significance. The aim of these *Sramanas* was to unveil the hidden truth of life so as to be able to obtain happiness and peace of mind. This new movement developed spontaneously in and through a number of different philosophical schools. One such school was that of the *lokayatas* or *Carvakas*. The *Carvakas* were the people who asserted the freedom of thought and will and denied boldly the operation of the law of Karma and the consequent determinism in the human-world.

Happiness as the End of Life

According to these philosophers, the aim of life was to live happily in the midst of a happy world. They were also

convinced that human happiness could be obtained only by living a moral and orderly life in a peaceful and well organised society, because orderly conduct was regarded as the essential feature of a good and happy life. Indisciplined and impure conduct can produce only disorder in human-life alongwith unhappiness—its inevitable results. They were eager to have a peaceful and well organised society which would not provide any scope for exploitation in any sphere of the social life. To them, even the simple joys of life were valuable. Happiness was supposed to be the only force which could enrich life with living freshness and inner dynamism. The materialists did not believe in the existence of any supernatural deity as the guide and ruler of human beings.

Happiness mixed with Pain

The Carvakas were right in declaring that nobody could enjoy pure or unmixed happiness, in his worldly life. We also feel that both pain and happiness are hard facts of life which can never be avoided by any one. So, a man should never be afraid of the sorrowful experiences of life and should never be dejected on that account. Human life should be viewed as a continuous struggle against and victory over sorrows and sufferings of life ; but since the basic note of human-life was supposed by the Carvakas to be happiness and nothing but happiness the human beings were advised to conquer unhappiness by facing it bravely and with circumspection. We came across the following passage of the Carvaka philosophy in the Sarvadarshana Samgraha of Madhavacharayya : "It is our wisdom to enjoy the pure pleasure as far as we can and to avoid the pain which inevitably accompanies it.—It is not, therefore, for us through a fear of pain to reject the pleasure." Such a secular attitude of the Carvaka School naturally kept its philosophical thought confined strictly to the worldly life and empirical existence ; even then we do find that this school had tried sincerely to give the world the vision of a harmoniously integrated human life streaming out from the heart of a perfect harmony of human values forming the ground stone of a good monarchical society.

*Carvaka Philosophy and the Socio-religious
Atmosphere of the Age :*

If we study the cultural history of the period in which the Carvaka School originated and flourished, we can very well attribute the anti-orthodoxy of the Carvakas to the degenerated socio-religious atmosphere of the age. Truly speaking, in the social life of the age, the fourfold division of the Aryan society was sufficiently hardened and the Brahmin class came to play the most dominating role in the political and cultural life of the Hindus. The priests alone became the custodian of both the mundane and the extra-mundane good of human beings. The current belief was that a man could enjoy happiness (both worldly and other worldly) only by following the instructions of the priest. Dharma was totally identified with the performance of religious sacrifices. The common belief was that human happiness could be brought about only by the performance of the various forms of sacrifices. The Vedic rites were supposed to possess wonderful magic power to fulfil human desires ; and so performance of these rites was the only kind of Dharma, the only kind of duty. The Brahmin priest was supposed to be the divinity in human form. In Spiritual power he was supposed to be next only to God and he was the person, specially chosen by the Almighty to guide and control the human-world. In fact, in every aspect of socio-religious life, it was the Brahmin class that used to demand precedence, honour and worship. It was against such unjust domination of the Brahmins together with their perverted teachings of dharma and adharma, resulting in merit and demerit that the materialistic philosophers raised their voice of protest. (*Dharmā-dharma na vidyate, na phalam puṇya papayoḥ.*). This school believed in the existence of those things only which could be verified directly or indirectly by sense-experience. In other words, the sensible world that lost its charm in the eye of the common man due to the perverted teachings of the Brahmins, was, again brought into the forefront of life by the up-holders of the materialistic faith. The world was to be

regarded as real and good. One should not therefore, be afraid of living and should not hanker after heaven and hell. They should not also impoverish themselves in wealth only to feed the greedy Brahmins. On the other hand, they should act wisely to build up happy and prosperous families and should have enough food and drink to be served to them at scheduled time of the day (Khāda, piva) and should not bother about death or life after death.

In the sphere of political life also, it appears to us from the available records that the materialists were in favour of accepting monarchy as the most effective form of government. (*Lokasiddho bhavet rājā*.....). The king was to be looked upon as the ruler of the people of a country. If anybody was to be called God, then it was he who could be so regarded. He was an earthly God, entrusted with the duty of looking after the material and moral well being of the people. Nobody should believe in the existence of any supernatural God who could be regarded as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the world. It was only as the ruler of the people that a king could be designated as 'Isha'; otherwise he had no divine spark in him. In fact, according to Carvakas, there was no such Divinity lying at the root of the world. It was in the age of the Carvakas that the primitive republican states based on the old tradition of primitive social solidarity were in a declining condition and the monarchical system was gaining ground; because of such a political atmosphere, the Carvakas seemed to have drifted towards the monarchical type of government. It appears that the conviction of this school was that only a just and honest king treating his people both affectionately and firmly, would be in a proper position to make his kingdom happy and prosperous. This conviction was, perhaps, due to the fact that by this time, the Aryan tribes had already consolidated in small kingdoms. Although due to remarkable development of the sacrificial cult of the Brahmanic tradition, the common people of the age were made to believe that they would be able to obtain peace and

prosperity here and hereafter only by performing sacrifices, still there were also free thinkers with keen intelligence and broad human sympathy who could realise the emptiness and absurdity of this religion of vedic sacrifices and were eager to save the common man from falling into the pit of misery to meet the intellectual death. The Carvakas, who constituted a group of such free thinkers were out to assert boldly that the sacrifices were not impregnated with any supernatural force to regulate the destiny of man. Their main concern was to add the flavour of humanity to the internal socio-political atmosphere by introducing freedom of thought and action in the secular life of man.

We have already noted that the Carvakas did not look upon the king as Divine. He was simply supposed to be the most worthy and authoritative person. They sincerely believed that a kingdom was bound to be prosperous if it was ruled by a good, powerful and honest king. It was the king who was to be held primarily responsible for both moral and material prosperity of the people. Such was the attitude of the Carvakas and they were out to propagate the philosophy of a happy human-life having its root in secularism and sound political administration. Their religion was the religion of humanity based on genuine sympathy and love for man and the world.

Carvakas and the Philosophy of Life of the Aryan People :

If we try to understand the socio-religious ideal of the R̥gvedic Aryans, we are sure to find that the true ideal of these people was happiness and fullness of life. The world was supposed to be saturated with honey and bliss. (*Madhuvāṭā Ritāyate, madhu Ksharanti Sindhavaḥ.*) Devas who were nothing but the manifestations of the supreme immortal light or *Amritajyotiḥ* in the forms of natural phenomena, used to gladden their hearts. The R̥gvedic sages were not recluses and did not want to live away from all material and human concerns. They were householders and were very eager to enjoy life. They wanted to unveil the secrets

of the universe not for the attainment of liberation but for deriving human usefulness from natural phenomena. As they were ignorant of any scientific and rational method of approach they were eager to control natural phenomena by winning the grace of their presiding deities through prayers and chanting of mantras. They did not discover that the worldly-life was in any sense, undesirable or painful. Had it been so, they would not have requested the gods to grant them a long and happy worldly-life. In and through the hymns, the sages had always expressed an intense desire to enjoy the life in this world to its full brim. It was this passionate love for both life and material prosperity which had actually inspired them to face the non-aryans of the Indus Valley; and it was the same passionate love for life and happiness of the world which drove the materialists to enter into an ideological fight with the priestly class. The other worldly attitude of the sacrificial cult and the consequent priestly domination of the age were poignantly criticised by the Carvakas. The Carvakas, too, wanted to taste the ambrosia of the worldly-life and for that reason they had fought so fearlessly against the Brahmanic tradition.

The historical records bear testimony to the fact that in the initial stage of monarchy, the Aryans were not in favour of recognizing the divine character of the king. The king was looked upon as a military leader only who was entrusted with the duty of defending his kingdom. He was a man of this world and he was expected to work for the material good and prosperity of his people. It was this secular attitude of the Aryans that had found a forceful expression in the philosophy of life of the Carvakas. According to both the Carvakas and the Aryans of the early stage, the ideal to be aimed at was a happy and healthy social life and so in this respect the Carvakas were not opposed to the Aryans. In fact, to live together by sharing a common life of happiness was the original ideal of the Aryans. Sannyāsa or renunciation was not a blossom of the Aryan-

thought. Even when renunciation was included in the four-fold scheme of life due to impact of the non-Aryan culture, it was accorded the fourth or the last place in the said scheme. On the other hand, it was the stage of the householder which was regarded as the most important one in the four-fold scheme of human-life.

Moreover, Mokṣa or liberation, which the Carvakas denied was also supposed to be really non-Aryan in origin. The dominant idea of the Aryan mind about human destiny was that of a future life in some other sphere of existence. It was only in the latest parts of the Vedas that the conception of liberation had made its appearance in a very vague form.

It is, therefore, reasonable to hold that originally the Aryans used to believe in the three ends of human-life—dharma, artha and kâma. In the Yajurveda for example, it has been stated that men should increase the store of goods (artha) acquired by honest and fair means (dharma) to be used for happiness of all (kâma). Such was also the belief of the Carvakas.

It is, therefore, wrong to hold that the Carvakas used to believe only in artha and kâma. If we study the teachings of the Carvakas with an open and unbiased mind we shall certainly admit that there is rational justification for believing that the materialists were not against dharma which was for them equivalent to orderliness, consistency and human sympathy. They were against dharma only when the word was used in the sense of sacrificial duty. The Mahabharata gives us the story of a Carvaka philosopher who cursed Yudhisthira for killing his own friends and relatives only for gaining the throne. Had "pleasure at any cost" been the ideal of the Carvakas, then such an event could never occur in the history of the great epic. To love and protect one's own relatives and friends is a socio-moral duty or dharma of a civilised nation and it is only a humanist or a believer in Mānava dharma who can raise his voice of protest

against the transgression of such socio-moral rules. So, the opponent's view that the Carvakas used to urge men to kill, dig, slay, burn or break to pieces all sacred things of life was not correct. In fact, the attitude of a Carvaka philosopher was to live only by choosing to live happily in this wonderful world of shade and light, misery and happiness. It was because of their firm faith in human values that they were so sharp in criticising the evil activities of the priestly class who were the master minds behind the economic, social and moral exploitation of people of the age. As the propagator of the ideal of a happy life for man, the Carvakas were the real successors of the Aryan people, who in all probability were the upholders of a positive humanistic philosophy in the sphere of mundane existence. So far as the enjoyment of worldly happiness is concerned, the Aryans were not less eager to obtain it than the Carvaka philosophers. Truly speaking, it was because the Aryans used to regard happiness as the elixir of life that in the upanisadic age the Supreme reality itself was declared to be of the form of bliss or happiness (*Bhumaiva Sukham*). We can, therefore, hold without reservation that the Carvaka philosophy was not in any way opposed to the philosophy of life of the early Aryans. This group of the Sramanas only attempted to bring into prominence the original aryan philosophy of a happy life by placing it on a firm rational and positive ground.

HEDONISTIC TONE OF THE CARVAKA PHILOSOPHY

It is known to all that the Carvaka movement was a movement of a group of free thinkers who were out to vindicate the rational and positive way of living against the traditionalism of the Vaidika priests. They actually denied the authority and the supremacy of the Brahmanas and asserted boldly the freedom of thought and will of the common people. The adherents of this movement had the outlook of a rationalistic philosopher and the secular attitude of the Carvakas inspired them to keep themselves confined strictly to wordly life and empirical existence.

Goal of Life

According to these philosophers the real goal of man was to enjoy happiness in all its varied forms, through ever-expanding flow of the stream of life at the human level. They were not in favour of searching the supraworldly values of life at the cost of the worldly ones. Life was a good thing for them and they were eager to bathe in loveliness of life, to appreciate life and to enrich life through constant intercourse with Nature and human society. In their opinion, the mosaic of a man's life should be built up only with the colourful experiences of the world. Those who believed that without a faith in the vedic rites and duties, there could be no meaning of life, were sadly mistaken. The body would perish and with the body, would perish naturally the glow of consciousness. According to the Carvakas, nobody could claim to have any experience of existence after death. Why should a man, therefore, believe in the absurd ideas of Karma and rebirth? This school believed in the existence of those things only which could be verified directly or indirectly by sense experience. In their opinion, therefore, one should not believe in heaven, hell or God which he would never be able to perceive. A man should be interested only in the world which he could see and feel so vividly and intensely. He should not, therefore, be afraid of living and

should not hanker after Heaven and Hell. On the other hand, he should spend his money on food, drink and other forms of material enjoyment. The other worldly attitude of the sacrificial cult should be given up and no expenses should be incurred on that account.

Forms of Enjoyment

The scanty materials of the Carvaka philosophy, so far available to us as the purvapaksa of the Vaidika philosophy and religion, reveal some forms of sensuous enjoyment which appear to a modern man as undignified and gross. So, the Carvaka-ethics is generally regarded as a lower form of hedonism. This view, however, may seem incorrect if the materialistic philosophy is studied in the cultural background of the age. If we go through the cultural history of the period, when this new movement of thought started, we are sure to find that the forms of enjoyment suggested by the Carvakas were not really unrefined and gross from the cultural standpoint of the age.

In the *Barhaspatya arthasastra*, for example, it has been stated that a man should seek the company of beautiful and erotically exciting woman (*matta kāmīnya sevya*). Again in the *Sarvadarshana Samgraha*, pleasure derived from the company of women, has been described by the materialists as a coveted end.

Now, the women, whose company was thus supposed to be the source of very exciting pleasures, belonged to a particular class, called *ganika*, who were free in establishing relation with men. These women were accomplished and affluent and they used to enjoy a high status in the society. Prostitution was not a socially condemned profession in that far off age. The *ganikas*, on the other hand, were trained with special care, in the fine arts such as music, dancing, singing, acting, composition of poetry, composition of riddles etc. They also used to receive instructions in Logic, Chemistry, Gardening, garland-making etc. They were, therefore, in a position to provide both lower and higher forms of worldly enjoyment. Even the

King of the country used to honour them. So, in the age of the Carvakas, a man, who is interested in the joys of human life could not overlook this charming source of empirical happiness. *Ambapali* was one of the most honoured courtesan of her time. Even the teachers and the trainers of the prostitutes used to receive encouragement from the King. We cannot, therefore, say that by suggesting such an honourably recognized source of happiness as a desirable end, the Carvakas have degraded their philosophy of happiness in any way.

Other forms of happiness suggested by the Carvakas are :—

- (1) *Āmravanam sevayet*
(should enjoy the beauty of mango-groves)
- (2) *Netrānjananā*
(should enjoy, putting collyrium in the eye) etc.

Nobody can deny that Nature with its magnificent splendours serves as a source of never-ending delight for human minds. To enjoy the beauty of a mango-grove in the midst of its foliage, flowers and sweet scented fruits, is not despicable. Adornment of the body also gives a man immense pleasure. Even in the present age, desirability of such forms of pleasures cannot be denied. Moreover, heaven which was the most cherished goal of the Vaidika people, was only a glorified abode of material pleasures with a celestial hue. In heaven, the spirits were supposed to enjoy material things like milk, honey, wine, ghee etc. They also used to delight in the joy of love in the company of beautiful and accomplished *apsarās*. These pleasures of heaven are no less gross than the worldly pleasures mentioned by the Carvakas. If, even after death, a spirit can indulge in such material pleasures without lowering its dignity in any way, then how can a living human mind be supposed to lose his human-worth by enjoying the mundane blessings of life in the forms of ordinarily enjoyed material pleasures? What the Carvakas wanted to emphasise was the positive value of the world and human-life. To them,

even the simple joys of life had a refreshing and stimulating force and as such these pleasures were not to be thrown away like dust and ashes. Happiness in any socially recognized form, was supposed to be stimulating having a refreshing effect on the body and the mind.

Attack on Vaidika-dharma

In the age of the Carvakas, the Brahmin class used to play the most dominating role in the socio-religious life of India. The priests alone used to be regarded as the deliverers of both mundane and extra-mundane good to human beings. The current belief was that men could enjoy happiness only by following the prescribed rites of the Vedas. Dharma was totally identified with the performance of Vaidika rites and sacrifices. These sacrifices were expensive and naturally the people had to spend a lot to earn religious merit. Dharma became an external commodity which was to be purchased at a high cost. It was, therefore, not unlikely that people often used to run into debt in order to fulfill their religious obligations. The Carvakas, therefore, asked the common man not to impoverish himself in wealth only to feed the greedy Brahmins who were simply exploiting him by a hoax. If one had to incur a debt, he should do so only for the nourishment of his own body and mind. (Riṇam Kritvā ghrītam pivet). Why should he suffer a financial loss in the hope of gaining a better after-life when nobody had any direct knowledge of life after death? "There is no heaven, no liberation, nor any soul in another world." The Brahmins were simply deceiving the innocent people by their perverted teachings of dharma and adharma, papa and punya. (*dharmā dharmau na vidyate na phalam puṇya pāpayoh*).

Hence:—

"While life is yours, live joyfully
None can escape Death's searching eye;
When once this frame of ours they burn,
How shall it ever again return." (1)

(1) *Sarva-Darśana-Samgraha Translated by E.B. Cowell & A.E. Gough.*

It is, therefore, not correct to hold that the Carvakas did not believe in the sense of cherished values of a human-life. It was the ideal of renunciation which had no fascination for them. Nor did they believe in the moral efficacy of the Vaidika sacrifices. It was only because they were very much shocked at the large-scale exploitation of the common people by the priestly class, that they came out in an open revolt against the sacrificial cult of the brahmins who were then at the height of glory and power. Carvakas were free thinkers with keen insight and broad human sympathy who could realise the worthlessness and absurdity of the Vaidika sacrifices and were eager to save man from misery and intellectual death. Dharma according to the Carvakas, was equivalent to social orderliness, consistency and human sympathy. Sacrificial performance was not to be equated with dharma. Priestly class was not the custodian of virtue and merit. The king was to be looked upon as the upholder of dharma as he alone was entrusted with the duty of looking after the material and moral well being of the people. It was because the king's duty was to lead his people to the path of moral progress that he was designated as Isha. It was his duty to establish a well organised kingdom where artha, acquired by honest means (dharma) could be used for the happiness of both the biological and mental levels of human-life. The Carvakas were often found condemning *himsā* (violence) and other impurities of mind. As gods were often described as displaying impure passions, they were called sinners by the Carvakas. (*Himsā priyah sadā krura māmsadaḥ pāpa kārinaḥ*). If anybody bathed the Mother Earth (*kritvā rudhira kardmam*) in warm blood of animals, he could not claim to have followed the path of dharma. Was dharma to be soaked in blood ?

Again in the *Rajadharmanushasana parva* of the Mahabharata Brihaspati instructed Indra by saying that sympathetic dealing with fellow beings was to be regarded as the only act which could enable a person to win the hearts of all. Even at the time of practising charity, one should use kind and

sympathetic words. The milk of sympathy alone could add sweetness to all social relations,

Conclusion

Thus, it is evident from the above discussion that sympathy, kindness, sweet words etc. were held in high esteem by the materialistic thinkers. In fact, these moral excellences were supposed to be the ingredients of Dharma by the Carvaka philosophers. Hell was nothing but a miserable state of worldly existence. A well-ordered society, on the other hand, was to be regarded as heaven with the king as the ruling God. So, the insistence on happiness which we find in the writings of the Carvakas should not be interpreted as an insistence at the cost of the human values. Their attitude to life was out and out healthy and moral. The Carvakas had urged that people should be courageous enough to be happy in the worldly life. If anybody chooses to live happily in this colourful world, breathing its sweet scented breeze and inhaling its fragrant flowers, he is not to be described as sinful and gross. Indeed, the penance or tapasya of the Carvakas was not for the joy of an extra-mundane life but for the unspeakable delight of the mundane existence expressed through every healthy movement of the body and mind of a human being. The purpose of life was supposed to lie not in the attainment of Heaven but in the establishment of a grand harmony between the human life and the pulsating life of the empirical world.

RITA, KARMA AND TAQDIR

One of the important concepts we can discover in the Rigveda, in support of the doctrine of the unity of Reality is the concept of *Rita*. *Rita* represents the law that underlies the orderliness of the whole universe. The physical world that we see and feel all around us is the reign of a universal law. The inherent music of the world is produced by the regular vibrations of an eternal law. This eternal law has been termed the *Rita* by the vedic sages. They were able to have glimpse of the *Rita* as creating a wonderful harmony of the diversities of the world and thereby causing the creation of ever-flowing fountain of joy and love. Since there is perfect harmony in the universe, there is also peace and serenity. There is no pronounced disharmony to throw the whole universe out of its own gear. The Dawn is arising every morning according to its own inherent power; the sun has been placed in the heaven in a fixed manner. Years, months and days, too, are moving in a cyclic order according to the *Rita*. Thus, the *Rita* is the basic law that has given the cosmos its bright and orderly face. The Rigvedic hymns say :

“Eternal law (*Rita*) hath varied food that strengthens ;
Firm-seated are eternal law’s foundations, in its fair
form are many splendid beauties.”

(Griffith)

Again :

“By holy law, long lasting food they bring us; by holy
law have cows come to our worship.”

(Griffith)

“Fixing eternal law, Indra too upholds it ;
swift moves the might of law and wins the booty.”

(Griffith)

“To law belong the vast deep earth and heaven.”

(Griffith)

Rita as the Moral Law :

Originally the word Rita was used to denote cosmic order and cosmic harmony. Gradually, from the physical, the conception as Rita was extended to the Moral World. Just as harmony is necessary in the physical world to produce a soothing and pleasing physical atmosphere, in the same manner, harmony between the higher and lower aspects of man is also necessary to keep him in existence as a human being and also to lead him to perfection. Rita is, thus, conceived as a moral law that enables a man to grow both morally and spiritually. Just as there should be orderliness in nature, in the same manner, there should be orderliness in human conduct also without which man will never be able to enjoy the undisturbed happiness of a group-life. The Rita, is thus the guiding law of both the physical and moral spheres.

The custodian of Rita :

Rita is not a god according to the R̥igveda. No prayer has been offered unto it. It is the law of orderly growth and orderly behaviour of the man and the universe.

Varuna is generally regarded as the ruler of the Rita. "He made them flow, the Aditya, the sustainer : the rivers run by Varuna's commandment." The physical phenomena can never disobey the Rita and the ruler of the Rita. Obedience to the Law Eternal is the secret of peace not only in the outer cosmos but also in the inner life of man. Sometimes, Agni too is spoken of as the ruler of the Ritam. The R̥igvedic hymn says. "Oh Agni ! Thou hast become Varuna, when thou strivest for the Rita."

Rita and karma :

Now, from the conception of Rita as the moral law (which is responsible for the apportionment of happiness and sufferings to human beings according to merits and demerits of their actions) has gradually grown, in a clear and definite form, the doctrine of Karma with its supreme ethical influence in the

domain of human-life. The Rita that assumes the form of the law of cause and effect in the physical world, appears again in the moral world as the law of Karma or retribution. The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad declares: "As is a person's desire, so is his will; and as is his will, so is his deed: and whatever deed he does, that he will reap." Every action in this world is followed by a corresponding reaction and it is this law of action and reaction which is called either the law of cause and effect or the law of Karma.

Karma: its Significance in Human Life:

The belief in Karma is deemed necessary to explain the inequalities of life. The visible inequalities in human life and action are not due to whims or sweet will of any supernatural power: these are the effects of the operation of a law of orderliness and retribution under the caption of the Law of Karma.

The Karma-doctrine emphasises that man is the maker of his own life. At every moment, he is creating his own future life by means of his various actions. There is nothing like a fate or destiny making human beings happy or miserable in spite of themselves. Human fate is nothing but the accumulated traces of his own interested actions done either in this life or in previous lives. The law of Karma holds that an individual has got to reap the fruits of all his motivated actions of the worldly life. It is the purity of the motive that actually determines the character of an action. Pure thoughts find spontaneous expression in pure actions which in turn lead to the creation of a peaceful and happy environment for the doer of the actions. Evil thoughts, on the other hand, pollute both the mind and the actions of the agent and create discord in his social setting. Thus, according to the law of Karma, man himself, is responsible for all that he goes through in his life and that there is no scope for assigning responsibility to any other being.

We should, however, remember that the sufferings of life, gone through by human-beings who have fallen off from the right path are not to be condemned as baneful and life-

destroying. The fires of life are necessary for spiritual growth and regeneration. In fact, sufferings and pains give a violent jerk to our entire life and then refix the root in the solid soil of goodness and moral potency. Man, thus becomes strong enough to stand erect even in the midst of injustice, unfairness and ingratitude. He gets an opportunity to dive deep into the fountain of life so as to be able to wash off all impurities which are generally found to pollute human actions. Yajna-*valkya*, the great sage of the Upanisadic period, remarked :—

“His Karma alone accompanies him; it is the guardian of his destiny.”

In fact, according to Indian tradition, man becomes higher or lower in psycho-biological attainments according to his own actions and Karma is the law which the supreme divinity follows in administering due retribution to every person for his action in the forms of joy and sorrow.

Taqdir :

In the Islamic religion too, the word *Taqdir* has been used by a group of Islamic scholars in the sense of a Law governing the entire creation. Each and every thing of the world that has been created by God, seems to be guided by its own *taqdir*. The Holy Book says : “God has created everything and then has ordained for it a *taqdir*. It is according to *Taqdir* or the Divine Law that the rains fall on the earth and that night and day follow each other.”

Taqdir is, thus, the law of growth and development of things and living beings of the world. Everything is developing according to its own inherent law of limited potentiality. In the domain of man who is blessed with the power to distinguish between right and wrong, *taqdir* appears also as the law of his moral growth and development. While explaining the meaning of a *Qadar* or *Taqdir* in The Religion of the Islam, Mr. M. M. Ali has said . “*Taqdir*, of which the Holy Book speaks is of a general nature, a law prevailing in the whole of the universe, a limitation under which the whole of creation

is moving onward." *Taqdir* does not mean fate or destiny which God has finally decided for a man. He never ordains that a human being should be a doer of evil or of good. Good and evil are not created by God and then assigned to human beings in different proportions. God has created man with certain powers at a limited measure for his physico-moral growth. He has to develop within limitations of his own inherent powers. It is upto man to use these powers either for good or for evil. Hence, it is clear that human beings have created their own pleasures and sufferings. The holy Quran speaks of certain powers and faculties with which man is endowed through the grace of God ; man can use these powers within certain limitations and "the limitations of each kind are its *taqdir*."

Responsibility Lies with Man :

It, therefore, follows that good and evil are created by the actions of human beings and that man enjoys what he himself has earned by his own good or bad deeds. The Muslims, thus seem to believe in human responsibility which amounts to believing in the freedom of human-will. Man is, no doubt, rewarded for his good actions and punished for all that is bad ; but both good and evil result from man's voluntary actions springing forth from his own free will. Man is finite and as such he is endowed with powers of physico-moral growth in a limited measure and this limited measure is his *taqdir*. When he uses his limited power in the service of God and fellow-men, his measure of power or *taqdir* is sanctified and he is blessed with peace and happiness. That every finite being is to be endowed with a limited measure of power to act and grow in this world is the Divine law or *Taqdir* which no created being can disobey. The actual measure of power, allotted to an individual is, however, his own individual *taqdir*. Now, as this allocation of power is made by God, He is commonly supposed to endow every creature with *taqdir* of its own. Now, if a man spoils his own *taqdir* by his own evil desires and motives, then it is he who is to be blamed and not God.

“Whatever evil is all from yourself.” Man, himself, commits sin and spoils his own taqdir with which he is blessed by Divinity.

Conclusion :

It is, therefore, not incorrect to say that the Rita of the Rigveda which is nothing but a universal law guiding and controlling the happenings of the world in an orderly and regulated way, keeping everything in its fixed place and forcing everything to grow according to its own inherent laws, resembles, in broad outlines, the Taqdir of the Islam which is also described as the divine law working throughout creation. According to both Rita & Taqdir everything in the world is subject to orderliness and consistency without which no cosmic life, in any form, is ever possible. Man should, therefore, use his powers and energies in such a manner as not to disturb the inherent harmony of the Divine Creation. He has no right which has no true source in the fundamental orderliness of the whole expansive universe. He has, no doubt, the freedom of action but at the same time, his humanity requires that he should act only to enrich the harmony of the essential orderliness of human-life and should not create any discordant note in its inherent symphony. Whenever the law of orderliness and consistency is violated, sufferings and pains envelop and darken the bright horizon of the human-world.

According to the religions of both the Hindus and the Muslims, man is the creator of his own happiness and pain. God never leads people astray. The individual himself spoils his own Karma or Taqdir by his own vicious will. It is not correct to hold that every bit of our living experience is strictly fore-ordained by God. In fact, “Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.” The religion of Islam asserts :

“Whatever of misfortune falls on one,

Of one's own doings, it is the result.”

According to Hinduism also :—

“Sukhasya dukkhasya na ko-pi-dātā
Parah dadāti-iti ku-buddhi esha”

(“Sorrow or joy none other gives to us
False is the thought that others give us these.”)

It is, therefore, clear that according to both the religions, action and its result are necessarily related. If a particular action is done, its effect is sure to follow. Just as “out of the date-stone, it is the palm only that grows” in the same way, it is unhappiness only that can grow out of an evil designed action. Both good and evil are man’s own demand. All living beings and things are influencing each other in a regulated manner. So if a man causes any disturbance in any sphere of the universe by his own ill-directed actions, he is sure to eat the poisonous fruit of the tree of sin which he himself has planted in the soft soil of his own being.

THE AVATARA AND THE JIVANMUKTA

We, in India, do not make any sharp distinction between Philosophy and Religion. This is because, philosophy, for us, is not merely an intellectual affair ; it is also a way of life—a regulator of human conduct.

According to Indian view, the human life is regulated not merely by the intellect but also by the feelings and emotions. So, both knowledge and love are the guiding principles of human-life and these two are nourished and cultivated in and through philosophy and Religion. The thorough and proper cultivation of the intellect makes a man conscious of the infinite nature of knowledge and a progressive culture of nobler emotions enables him to taste the inexplicable sweetness and happiness of Infinite Love and Emotion. Hence, in India, philosophy is intimately related to Religion.

The Avatāra

The theory of the Divine descent is mainly a topic of Theology and as such this theory has its appeal more to the heart than to the intellect of a human being. In the eyes of a religious person, God is not only the indwelling principle of the whole universe of things and beings. He is also the repository of all values. As of Supreme Value, God is endowed with infinite auspicious qualities of which tenderness, affection, compassion etc. are important from the standpoint of the devotee. Due to the presence of these qualities, God is regarded as the preserver of the world. He is ever ready to help everyone who seeks his refuge. He loves his devotee so much that he does not hesitate to come down to this world to satisfy his devotee's desire for union. In fact, the word *avatāra* has been derived from the Sanskrit word *avataranam* meaning descent. An *avatāra* of God refers to that particular form of God which he assumes in order to come down to the expirical world which is full of strifes and struggles, miseries and frustrations.

Motive behind Divine descent :

Since God is loving and immeasurably compassionate, He can not always remain away from His devotee who is mad with love for Him. The main purpose of God's incarnation, therefore, is to come within the easy access of his devotees.

Another purpose is to punish the wicked with a view to saving vedic dharma and social stability which depend mainly on the preservation of the traditional creeds and laws of different varṇas and āśramas. Both these purposes have been mentioned in the Bhagavadgita.

Now, the forms that God assumes in all his descents are non-natural. These forms are made of pure sattva (śuddha sattva) and this body is not affected by the influences of actions. Even when He comes down to this world, His Divine nature remains unimpaired. God comes here of His own accord.

It is because God possesses His divinity even in the stage of incarnation that Krishna was able to show His cosmic form to Arjuna who was given divine eyes for that purpose. Of course, in His avatāra form, God generally remains enveloped in His own yogamāyā with a view to appearing to ordinary human beings as human and mortal.

Jīvanmukta :

A Jīvanmukta puruṣa too is not affected by selfish desires and his actions are all disinterested (meant only for the good of the suffering humanity). His knowledge, too, is infinite. He is an extraordinary person in all respects. Love and wisdom constitute the keynote of his being. He is also not lazy. It is true that he has no ends to attain and no obligation to anyone in the worldly sense. Still he has to act constantly for the good of the suffering humanity. He is the living example, the guiding star in the midst of the ocean of human tears. The disinterested actions of the Jīvanmukta puruṣa help others in the path of liberation. This being the case, one may pose a question: why should we believe in the avātaravāda when the Jivanmukta puruṣa is before us, to render all possible assistance in distress and

suffering ? Jīvanmukta puruṣa, being a super personality, is best fitted to do all that is done by the avatāra form of God to keep the world in a stable and useful condition.

Jīvanmukta less competent than Avatāra :

The Jīvanmukta is incapable of doing what can be done by the Avatara as the avatara is the same as the Supreme Divinity. The Jīvanmukta, on the other hand, is a man who has reached the stage of liberation by his own spiritual sadhana. Even when liberated, a Jīvanmukta has to remain encased in a mortal body to reap the fruits of his prārabdha karmas (although he is not disturbed by the effects of such actions). An avatāra, on the other hand, is not subject to any kind of karma bandhana (bondage, due to action). He is free in the true sense of the term as he is not bound by the law of karma. His body does not involve any enjoyment on his part as there can never be any sakāma karma in the case of the avatāra. Mere possession of a body does not make one go through the experiences of pleasures and pains. The fire can reduce a piece of paper to ashes but water cannot be so reduced by fire. Similarly though the avatara possesses a body, the body cannot become a tool for avatara's enjoyment. The avatāra body of God is non-material, is eternally free from sins and sorrows of human life.

His birth, in this world, is due to the (i) adriṣṭas or merits and demerits of his parents. (ii) Accumulated merits and demerits of all people of the country in which he is born.

A Jivanmukta puruṣa, on the other hand, is one who has worked out his own life of freedom by his own actions. Prior to his attainment of emancipation, he remains a bound soul and like a brave traveller he undertakes a difficult and long journey to an altogether new region. One must struggle hard through many lives, if one sincerely desires to attain liberation. An avatara, on the other hand, does not work out his liberation through pious and disinterested actions of many lives. He is ever free. His assumption of a body is just a sport (Līlā).

Further, even when a Jīvanmukta works disinterestedly for the good of the world, his disinterested actions, constitute, in the initial stage, only steps to emancipation which is his own highest good (svakalyāṇa). Disinterested actions, performed by the Jivanmukta (in the stage of an aspirer) with the attitude of humility devotion and selfless love for the whole universe, is nothing but his spiritual sadhana which is wholly beneficial to his own emancipation. No such sadhana, is however, necessary in the case of the avatara of God. The avatara never suffers from the illusion of narrow egoism. He is ever free. He has no sense of ownership of worldly actions. He is divine and his divinity always finds free expression in all his movements. Thus, it is clear that an avatara, being a sportive form of God, is in a better position to do real good to this world. The super personality of an avatara arouses immense pleasure in the hearts of the pious people whereas vicious persons get afraid of his extraordinary personality. Creation and dissolution of the world can be brought about only by an avatara and not by a Jivanmukta puruṣa. Even today the pious people of India believe sincerely that God will, again, come down to earth in the form of kalki avatara to destroy this sinful Kali age.

Avatāravāda, not dogmatic :

God, in our religion, is always described as loving, compassionate and full of mercy, These characteristics of God can be manifested only in relation to the devotees. Just as the devotee is incomplete without God, in the same manner, God also is incomplete without His devotee. The devotees are incessantly calling God to them, they are pining for Him, dying for Him, suffering terribly from the pang of separation from Him. So, for pleasing and helping his devotees, it is natural for a loving God to come down to this world in various forms which apparently are similar to the forms of the mortal human beings. The devotee also gets heartfelt satisfaction from the thought that if he clings to God sincerely and seriously in an attitude of purity and humiliation,

God will surely come down to unite with him. This belief works wonder in the life of the devotee and this subjective necessity cannot be overlooked by any rational mind. If we believe in the existence of a loving God full of mercy and compassion and if we believe in grace then a belief in divine descent does follow as a logical corollary.



MADHU SUDAN SARASWATI : THE GREAT ADVAITA SCHOLAR

I

Madhu Sudan Saraswati, a great advaita scholar is the author of the booklet entitled "Advaita ratna rakṣaṇam". This small book has so far drawn the attention of a very limited section of oriental scholars. In this important work, the author has made a special attempt to establish nondualism of Śaṅkara after refuting the objections raised against advaitavāda by the supporters of the bheda sat vāda. He has referred to a number of the śruti and smṛti texts showing how these are interpreted by the supporters of the bheda sat vāda. Madhu Sudan has also made an attempt to show the defects in the interpretations of the opponent group thereby proving that all śruti and smṛti texts should be interpreted from the advaita point of view.

I have written this special article with a view to placing before the scholarly world the main solution of some of the important objections of the bheda sat vāda by Madhu Sudan Saraswati. The Advaita ratna rakṣaṇam has been written in the Navya-Nyāya style and perhaps for this reason the book is not very popular with us. I have, therefore, made an attempt to present the views of this great scholar in a popular style. I am particularly referring to his views expressed in "Śrutinām-bhedaparatvabhangaḥ".

The following are the Śruti and śmṛti texts considered in this article :

1. Ātmā vṛ are draṣṭavyaḥ, śrotavyo mantavyo nididhya-sitavyaḥ.
2. Ātmanā vā are darśanena śrutyā matya vijñānenedam sarvaṁ vijñātaṁ bhavati.
3. Dehādestāttvikādbhedaṁ satyaṁ cātmanyajanatām, mumukṣuṇām namokṣoestī.....

4. Asthūlam ananum etc.
5. Dve brahmaṇī veditavye param cāparameva ceti ..
6. Dvā sūparṇā sayujā sakhayā samānam vṛkṣam pariṣa-
svajate etc.
7. Puruṣa sūkta of the Ṛgveda.
8. Ajñānenāvṛtām jagat tena muhyanti jantabaḥ.
9. Tadviśṇoḥ paramam padam.
10. Etasmāt Jayate prāṇo manaḥ.....
11. Etasmat ātmano akāśaḥ sambhutaḥ.
12. Tat tvamasti.
13. Ayamātmā brahma.....
14. Ksetrajnam cāpi mām viddhi.....
15. Na tu tat dvitīyamasti.....
16. Ekamevādvitīyam.....
17. Neha nānāsti kincana.
18. Mṛtyoh sa mṛtyumāpnoti ya iha nāneva pasyati.

Interpretation from the point of view of Bheda Sat Vāda

According to the supporters of the reality of difference, all sorts of differences such as the difference between matter and the soul : the difference between the soul and the soul: the difference between one material body and the other: the difference between the soul and the highest reality—are metaphysically real. One who fails to accept this metaphysically real difference, moves round the cycle of birth and death. Non-acceptance of the metaphysical reality of difference is the root cause of the worldly existence. In the opinion of these thinkers, the meaning of the statement, dehadest-āttivikādbhedam is that liberation can never be obtained by those who do not realise the distinction between the metaphysically real matter and the soul. Every jiva possesses knowledge of difference. There is no human being who does not feel the presence of difference. So, all the śruti and the smṛti texts should be interpreted in such a manner as to prove the reality of difference.

The śruti text “asthūlam ananum” etc. declare nothing but the reality of difference. The use of “a” in asthūlam etc.

confirms nothing but the reality of difference. Brahman has been distinguished from the material body which is gross. Brahman has been distinguished from the mind which is atomic in size. So, knowledge of difference is the true metaphysical knowledge. One who possesses this knowledge attains liberation.

Again, the śruti text “Dve brahmaṇī veditavye” also teaches the reality of difference. Here a distinction has been made between para brahma and aparabrahma. “Dvā sūparṇā” similarly teaches that difference is the metaphysical truth. This is because in all these texts dvitva has been used and dual number is used only where there is difference. Dvitva is bheda vyāpta and so on the basis of dvitva difference can legitimately be inferred.

The puruṣa sūkta of the R̥gveda should also be understood to imply difference, because there also we find mention of a thousand heads etc. In tadviṣṇoḥ paramampadam the sixth case ending has been used and this proves nothing but the reality of difference.

The questions put by Matreyi and the answers given by Yajñavalkya also prove the reality of difference, because questions and answers can be made only if difference is admitted as real. Where there is absolute non-difference there is nobody to ask question and nobody to give a reply.

Further the Śruti-text ātmā vā are draṣṭavyah etc teaches that the soul can be realised by four forms of knowledge acquired through hearing, through vision, through reflection and through meditation.

According to bheda sat vadīnyāya, the mind is eternal. So, the mind can never become non-existent or false. How can then a non-dualist say that all things except Brahman are false? The śruti text that teaches “etāsmat ātmano akāśa sambhūtaḥ” should be understood in two ways. The word sambhūtaḥ means prakāśa (manifestation) in the case of eternal categories and production (utpatti) in the case of non-eternal things.

Even the mahāvākya tattvamasi śvetaketoh shows distinction between addressee, address and the addressor. The text "Natu tat divīyamasti" does not declare that there is no other thing except Brahman. On the contrary, it says that there is no second Brahman. Ekamevādvitīyam, too, does not establish the falsity of everything except Brahman. What it asserts is that God is one and not more than one. When we say that the king of this mandala is advitīya or the kimsuka tree of this forest is advitīya, we mean to assert simply that there is not more than one king in that particular mandala and that there is not more than one kimsuka tree in that forest. We do not mean to negate the existence of elephants, horses and other trees by uttering these sentences.

Although the śruti texts like mṛtyoh sa mrtyumāpnoti etc or neha nā nāsti kincana declare the falsity of manyness, still these are contradicted by the perceptual knowledge of difference. Where perception establishes duality and difference, śruti cannot negate that knowledge by preaching non-duality and non-difference.

Madhu Sudan's solution from the advaita point of view

According to Madhu Sudan, there is no pramāṇa to establish that liberation can be attained only through knowledge of difference. Had there been any proof in favour of difference, then the Śruti too would have declared the reality of difference. All Śruti texts such as ātmano vā are darśanena śrutyā, matyā vijñānenedam sarvam vijñatam bhavati or tvameva viditvā atimṛtyumeti etc declare in one voice that liberation can be attained only by the realisation of nondual ātman. According to the supporters of difference, liberation is effected only when the soul is differentiated from the metaphysically real body. This is not really the true teaching of the scripture. From the point of non-dualism, it can be asserted that one who has not been able to realise the false difference of the soul from the false body and sense-organs, should be given instructions in the subject of non-dualism. There is

really no intellect which does not perceive non-difference in one form or another, and there is no source of knowledge that does not establish non-difference. In fact the use of "a" in *asthūlam ananum* does not establish difference. This śruti text makes us familiar with the quality-less nature of Brahman and does not suggest that an aspirant should try to gain the knowledge of difference between Brahman and other things of the world. Nor is it logical to say that this *asthūlam śruti* is to be understood as giving us knowledge of both difference and Brahman, because a difference in significance can be admitted when there is a difference in the sentences used. One and the same text cannot have opposite purport such as difference and non-difference.

Further the śruti never says that it is because Brahman is different from the body that it is called *asthūlam*. There is no *hetu hetumat* relation between the two. So declaration of difference cannot be the real significance of this Śruti text. It is also not proper to hold that admission of *tādātmya* between the two radically different metaphysical reals like matter and soul is the cause of the worldly life. According to śruti and *smṛti*, the ignorance of the true nature of Brahman is the root cause of this universe: "Ajnānenāṅṣṭam jagat tena muhyanti jantavaḥ". All of us possess such knowledge of difference as is manifested in the cognition of "my body". Still we are going through pains and suffering of life. We have not been liberated. Even the śruti text, namely *dve brahmaṇī veditavye* etc does not establish difference. If the *bheda vādī* says that the use of *dvitva* proves difference, then the reply from the *advaita* point of view will be that this inferential knowledge of difference is contradicted by the *abheda śruti* texts like *Tattvamasi, ayamātmā brahma* etc. In fact, no metaphysical difference is suggested by the Śruti text "dve Brahmaṇi etc." Knowledge of *apara brahma* is necessary for acquiring the knowledge of *para brahma*. This *ānusaṃgika bheda jñāna* between *para brahma* and *apara brahma* is due to *avidyā*.

In the same manner, the śruti text *Dvā suparṇā*, indicates apparent difference only and not real difference between *jivātmā* and *paramātmā*. Just as one and same tree may be both *kapisamyogi* and *non-kapisamyogi* when looked at from the point of view of *avacchinna* and *anavacchinna*, in the same way, *brahman* can be viewed as *jivatma* and *paramatma* when considered from different standpoints.

In the *puruṣa sūkta* too, there is no word that signifies difference. The apparent sense in which the *Bheda vadī* has tried to interpret it proves difference in respect of body only and not in respect of spirit. The expression like “thousand heads etc.” does not describe the real metaphysical form of the great *puruṣa*. This expression simply describes the imaginary form of *puruṣa* suitable for *upāsanā*. It is only when the *sattva guṇa* of the mind is purified by *upāsanā*, that the aspirant reaches the stage in which *Brahman* can be realised immediately.

Further, the use of the sixth case ending in *tadvisṇoḥ paramam padam* does not prove difference. Sixth case ending can be used in those cases also where there is no difference. As for example in the case of the head of the *Rāhu*. (*Rāhoḥ*...

The conversation that took place between *Maitreyī* and *Yājñavalkya* also centered round the imaginary difference of the empirical world. The self is to be seen, to be heard of etc, too, has been spoken of on the basis of the false world. When the non-dual metaphysical truth is realised, all questions and all queries cease immediately. Question-answer in respect of the Highest Truth is useful so long as the aspirant has not reached the highest goal. The *nyāya* contention that the mind is eternal and so the non-dualist cannot assert the falsity of everything except *Brahman*, is also not logically acceptable. The śruti clearly states the non-eternality of the mind by calling it a product. It is not proper to interpret the word “*sambhūta*” in two senses –manifestation and production. The *adhikaraṇa* namely *yāvadvikāramtu vibhāga iti* proves the falsity of everything except *Brahman*.

The difference between the addressee, address and the addressor supposed to be implied by Tattvamasi Śvetaketoh, is also the difference of the empirical world. This vyavahārika bheda is also recognised by the supporters of the Advaita Vedānta. The jivas are distinguished from one another by means of their different limiting adjuncts in the forms of the body, antaḥkaraṇa etc. But texts like ayamātmābrahma, ksetrajnam cāpimā viddhi etc. point out nothing but non-dualism.

It is indeed true that texts like natutadvitīyamasti, ekamevādvitīyam etc negate the existence of everything except Brahman. In the conversation between Maitreyi and Yajñavalkya we find Maitreyi asking the following question :

“Why is it that one does not see the other in the final stage? Is it because no consciousness exists in the highest stage? While giving an answer to the question, Yajñavalkya has clearly stated that in the final stage there is only Brahman and nothing else. So the question of seeing the other does not arise at all. This reply of the great sage proves beyond doubt that the Śruti texts teach nothing but advaita .

The advaita śruti ekamevādvitīyam, too, proves the truth of non-dualism. The word “ekam” eliminates the possibility of sajātīya-bheda. When a man says “there is one jar” he means to suggest the absence of all other jars except that one. The word advitīyam negates vijātīya bheda (na vidyate dvitīyam yasya). Although the word advitīyam possesses the potency of establishing the reality of Brahman only, after falsifying the world of multiplicity, still with a view to preventing a less intelligent person from wrongly ascribing the distinction between dharma and dharmā to Brahman on the plea of ekatva, eva too has been used along with ekam and advitīyam. The examples selected by the supporters of difference from the practical life such as “there is secondless king in this mandal” are not suitable from the philosophical point of view. When a king is described as “secondless” the intention of the

speaker is to praise the king who has no rival. The speaker does not mean to suggest the falsity of all other things because in practical life other things are as much perceived objects as the king.

The contention of the *bheda vādi* that the non-dualistic significance of śruti texts like “*mrtyoḥ sa mrtyumāpnoti...*” or “*neha nānāśti kincana*” etc. is contradicted by the fact of duality perceived in this world, is also not justifiable. The question of negating one source of knowledge by another arises only when they convey contradictory cognitions regarding the same subject-matter. Here the subject of Śruti is different from that of perception. Perception gives us knowledge of that object only which is immediately present before us. It cannot give us knowledge regarding the being of an object which exists beyond the present. So perception is not competent to reveal the non contradicted being of an object in past, present and future. While the śruti declares that the multiplicity and difference cannot claim non-contradicted existence in past, present and future, perception reveals that multiplicity and difference are not contradicted on the empirical level. Since the śruti and perception give different declarations, the śruti cannot be contradicted by perceptual knowledge.

Difference is proved by experience. The aim of the scripture is to enlighten man on such subjects which cannot be otherwise established. So, difference which is established by our everyday experience cannot be the purport of the scripture. Hence, both introduction and conclusion of the Śruti should be understood as teaching and preaching non-difference.

Brahman, the highest reality is non-attached, without a second, of the form of pure consciousness and is also the only metaphysically real category. The world is false like a dream and is a product of illusion. There can never be a real relation between the truth and the untruth, between the changeable and the unchangeable, between the soul and the non-soul : so the śruti declares the existence of Brahman which is devoid of all

false relations and which is also the substratum of all illusory cognition.

Conclusion

Reality or non-reality of multiplicity and difference is a very important controversial issue in ancient Indian philosophy. Sense-organs of the individual are so constituted that they are always directed to external diversity, whereas the tendency of reason is to discover unity in variety. Those who cannot deny wholly the reality of perceptual knowledge obtained through external organs, are naturally inclined to admit the reality of difference. The knowledge of difference as a fact of our empirical life is not, however, denied by anybody. Whether this difference is metaphysically admissible or not is the real issue of philosophical discussion. The *vāsana* or *samskāra* that originates from our daily experiences naturally becomes very firmly rooted in us. So we do not readily agree to disbelieve the reports of our various sense-organs. Since difference is a fact of perceptual experience, it receives our approval easily; but if we seriously reflect on the power and potency of perception to prove the reality of difference, we become apprehensive, because we find that the external object cannot fully be known through perception. In the perception of the whole (*avayavi*) for example, our sense-organ does not get related to all the parts : hence the *sautrantikas* maintain that the external objects cannot be known through perception. They are to be established only through inference. Indeed, we find that it is difficult for us to assess the value of perception as a source of knowledge and unless that can be done, the reality of difference cannot be established.

When the jar is perceived, is it a fact that we also perceive its difference from the cloth ? If the difference is perceived, do we perceive the difference of the jar from all other objects or from one particular object only ? The opponent of the *advaita-vāda*—may reply that when he perceives the jar, he perceives

its difference from all the objects known to him. If this be so, then again, a further question will arise : "Will the objects unknown to the opponent be perceived as non-different from the jar ?" If so, then the opponent will have to admit non-difference at least in regard to unknown things. If the opponent refutes this by saying that in respect of unknown objects, there is not even the perception of non-difference, then from the advaita point of view, he may be requested to hold that in respect of known objects, too, there does not occur perception of difference.



MADHU SUDAN SARASWATI : THE GREAT ADVAITA SCHOLAR II

In the previous article, I made an attempt to present the views of Madhu Sudan Saraswati with particular reference to his views expressed in “*śrutīnām bheda-paratva bhangaḥ* (*Adavita ratna rakṣaṇam*).

In this article I shall make an attempt to present his views with reference to his *sūtra* No. 4 i. e. *atha sarva buddhibheda viśaya bhangaḥ*.

It is generally held against the Advaita Vedānta that the non-dual scriptural texts which are admitted by the Advaita-school as evidence for the declaration of the Highest Being as differenceless, cannot be accepted in that manner ; because the sources of knowledge such as perception etc. which prove difference will then be opposed to these *śruti*-texts.

Madhu Sudan Saraswati in his *sūtra* “*atha sarva buddhibheda viśaya bhangaḥ*” points out that this view of the realistic school is unsound. This is because perception can never reveal difference.

Incapacity of the Perceptual Knowledge to Reveal Difference :

Perception is generally divided into two forms—indeterminate (*nirvikalpaka*) and determinate (*savikalpaka*). The Advaita Vedānta holds that *nirvikalpa pratyakṣa* is incapable of revealing difference since it manifests only the differenceless pure being. Even *savikalpaka* perception which grasps a qualified object does not, in the Advaita opinion, reveal difference of one qualified object from another. When the jar is perceived, the determinative intellect or the *savikalpaka* *buddhi* only assumes the form of “this is jar”, “this is cloth” etc. In other words in the determinate knowledge of the jar, the things present before the perceiver are, at the very first moment, the

jar, jarness and the relation between the jar and the jarness etc. It is the *vaiśiṣṭya* in the form of the relation between the jar and the jarness which is grasped only in the full-fledged determinate knowledge of the subsequent moment and there is no other thing present that can be admitted as difference.

It cannot be said that the difference is an ingredient of *vaiśiṣṭya* because we find that *bheda* and *vaiśiṣṭya* are always mentioned separately by different words. The realists may object by saying that *vaiśiṣṭya* should not be supposed as an extra-thing, different from difference, as in that case, the law of parsimony will be violated. *Vaiśiṣṭya* is to be regarded as a form of difference because it is the *vaiśiṣṭya* of the jar that differentiates the jar from all other things which are not jars. This is what is known also as *atdvyāvṛtti*. So the difference which is of the form of *ananyābhāva* is the same as *vaiśiṣṭya*. Hence, the knowledge of *vaiśiṣṭya* is the knowledge of difference. Udyānācārya has said : *atdvyāvṛtti vaiśiṣṭyamiti*. Here Madhu Sudan Saraswati raises a question : how does knowledge of *vaiśiṣṭya* in the form of *atdvyāvṛtti* arise in the case of the cognition of the jar, arising just after the passing away of the *nirvikalpaka* stage ? He further assumes that the realistic school will perhaps try to answer his question by saying that just as prior to the knowledge of the qualified object in the *savikalpaka* stage, one has to have hypothetical knowledge of *viśeṣaṇa*, and also the recollection of the *saṃjñā*, in the same manner prior to the cognition of *vaiśiṣṭya* in the *svaikalpaka* stage, recollection of *vaiśiṣṭya* has to be supposed. The possible answer of the realists, however, is not acceptable to Madhu Sudan Saraswati because *vaiśiṣṭya*, in the Advaita view, must be something over and above the noun, adjective and their relation. Even in the *savikalpaka* stage (as we have seen), the knowledge of the first moment, is different from the knowledge of the second moment. In the first moment, we have the knowledge of stick, man and the relation, whereas in the second moment, we have the knowledge of a man with a stick (*Dandī puruṣa*). There is difference between cognitions of

these two moments. There is something more in the second cognition (because *daṇḍa* is cognized as being related to *puruṣa* as an attribute) than in the first. This "something more" is termed as *vaiśiṣṭya*. If we do not hold that there is something more in the second moment than there is in the first, then the knowledge of the first moment too will be the knowledge of a qualified object.

Since it is impossible to explain *savikalpaka* cognitions of the two moments without considering *vaiśiṣṭya* as something additional besides noun, adjective and relation and also as merging only in the second moment, the question of violating the law of parsimony does not arise at all.

In the opinion of Madhu Sudan Saraswati, *vaiśiṣṭya* cannot be regarded as a form of *atadvyāvṛtti* even from the point of view of the realistic *Nyāya* school. This is because unless there is the knowledge of non-blue, there cannot be knowledge of the difference from non-blue (i. e. *anīla-vyāvṛtti* or *anīlabheda*) in the case of the cognition of a blue lotus. If it is urged by the realists that here the memory of non-blue will serve the purpose, then too, the situation will not improve; because memory of non-blue is not possible unless there is prior knowledge of the blue. How does the knowledge of blue arise in the first stage? Moreover, everything besides blue is included in non-blue and so it is not possible for any human being to have a full knowledge of the non-blue in one life.

We may ask what actually is meant by *anīla-vyāvṛtti*? Does it mean difference from blue? Or does it mean some positive thing that can be designated as *anīla*? If it is the former, then there will be the fallacy of mutual dependence. Blue is to be known as something different from non-blue and non-blue is to be known as something different from blue. Then how are we to know these two mutually dependent objects? If we accept the latter alternative (i.e. non-blue referring to something positive) then the knowledge of that positive thing is occurring without the knowledge of difference (*vyāvṛtti jñāna*), If this is so, then we can

very well say that the knowledge of blue too, arises without the knowledge of *vyavṛtti*. Truly speaking, when we cognize the cow, our cognition takes the form of "cow" only and there is no knowledge of the negation of non-cow. *Gotva-vaiśiṣṭya* which is revealed in the awareness of the cow is positive and not negative. It is, therefore, not proper to explain cowness in terms of *agouvyāvṛtti*. Again, if cowness is the same as *agau-vyāvṛtti*, then cowness as a universal will not be established and this will be prejudicial to the philosophical position of the realistic school.

The author of *Tattvacintamani* has said that it is only after one is aware of *daṇḍi puruṣa*, that he comes to cognize *adaṇḍa-vyāvṛtti* (negation of non-stick) in the *daṇḍi puruṣa*. Had the first moment of *savikalpaka* knowledge been the revealer of *vyavṛtti*, the word *anantara* would not have been used.

Comments

If we analyse critically the perceptual position of the *Nyāya* and the Advaita school in the light of what has been stated by Madhu Sudan Saraswati in this particular *sūtra*, we find that the two positions differ from each other in the following manner :

According to Advaita Vedānta, the first moment of the determinate knowledge reveals noun, adjective, relation etc. in unrelated units. It is only in the second moment that the knowledge of the thing (noun) as qualified by the attribute (*vaiśiṣṭyāvagāhi*) arises. So the knowledge of *vaiśiṣṭya* arises in the second moment of the determinate knowledge. According to the *Nyāya* school, the noun, adjective, relation etc are cognized as unrelated units in the indeterminate knowledge which resembles to a great extent the first moment of the determinate knowledge of the Advaita vedānta. The stage in which the substantive-adjective relation is established is known as the *savikalpaka* or the determinate stage by the *Nyāya*-school. Now this cognition of substantive-adjective

relation is what is necessary for the knowledge of difference. Just as knowledge of two is at least necessary for having combination or relation between things (because *sva* cannot be relative to *sva*), in the same manner cognition of at least two things is necessary for having the knowledge of difference (Sva cannot be differentiated from *sva*). After the arousal of this cognition, the knowledge of difference arises easily, provided there is no *pratibandhaka* to prevent it. Now the positions of these two schools when analysed from the point of view of knowledge and also from the point of view of object (*sāmagri*), stand as follows :

Advaita point of view

1. *Jnana-viśleṣaṇa* : First moment of determinate knowledge; knowledge of noun, adjective, relation etc. in unrelated conditions (*viskalita jñāna*).

2. *Vaisistya-jñāna* : In this stage, there is an increase in knowledge.

1. *Sāmagri viśleṣaṇa* : First moment of determinate knowledge : Noun, adjective, relation etc as unrelated units.

2. Emergence of *vaisistya* as relation between noun and adjective. In other words there is emergence of something new as a result of *ghata-ghatatva sambandha*. So, there is an increase on the objective side (*sāmagri-kṣetra*).

The Nyāya point of view

Jnana-viśleṣaṇa :

1. *Nirvikalpaka* stage of knowledge where there is awareness of noun, adjective, relation etc. as unrelated units.

2. *Savikalpaka* stage of knowledge : knowledge of substantive adjective relation. (Increase in knowledge).

Samagri-vislesana :

1. *Nirvikalpaka* and *savikalpaka* do not differ in their *sāmagri* or object.

2. *Savikalpaka* unfolds all that is implicitly involved in the *nirvikalpaka* stage. So there is no increase in the object. The knowledge may be regarded as containing the seed of the knowledge of difference.

From the above analysis, it is clear that according to both the schools the cognition of *vaiśiṣṭya* arises only after the awareness of the noun, adjective, relation etc. as unrelated units. Differences of opinion arise only in respect of the form of *vaiśiṣṭya*. The Advaita holds that when there is *vaiśiṣṭya-jñāna*, something new and positive is added to the content or object of cognition. So *vaaiśiṣṭya* is not the same as *atadvyāvṛtti*. According to Nyāya however, the object or content remains the same from the first moment to all the subsequent moments. In fact, when the undifferentiated whole is analysed and substantive-adjective relation is cognized spade work for the knowledge of difference is done by the perceiver. *Vaiśiṣṭya*, in the opinion of the Nyāya school, is the same as *atadvyāvṛtti*. So from the Nyāya point of view, there is no increase on the objective side of knowledge. Changes occur only in the knowledge-aspect.

The author of the "*Tattva Cintāmani*" has no doubt said that cognition of *adaṇḍa-bheda* arises after the cognition of *daṇḍi puruṣa*; but this statement truly implies that it is from the point of view of knowledge only that *atadvyāvṛtti* arises after *sambandha*; from the point of view of the object, however, there is no change. Again, the seed of *bheda grahana* is sown as soon as the perceiver cognizes *daṇḍi puruṣa*. So there is no harm if one admits or does not admit *ānantarya* between *sambandha* and *atadvyāvṛtti*. According to Advaita, the noun, the adjective, the relation etc. nay, the whole of the object of knowledge is *vikalpā* (thought construction). When there is increase in knowledge, there is also an increase in the *visaya* of knowledge. According to Nyāya, however, the object of knowledge is real. There is *sannikarṣa* between the sense organ and a real object. Since the object is real, it remains the same from the first moment of *sannikarṣa* till the end. Knowledge of the object may be vague or clear, *viśada* or *aviśada* but there can be no change in the real object of knowledge.

SURESVARACHARYA : THE GREAT ADVAITA PHILOSOPHER

That birth is not really a painful fall from the height of Divinity is best illustrated by the glorious life of Suresvaracharya who was born in the ninth century A. D. By coming to this world, he was indeed able to serve the humanity as a source of never-ending Light for ages to come. He was a worthy heir to advaita tradition because he had to his credit a number of advaita texts of which *Naiskarmyasiddhi* was the most valuable.

Suresvara & Mandana Misra

The commonly-held view about Suresvara is that he and Mandana were not two different persons. It was Mandana who was named Suresvara when he became a disciple of Samkara. Mandana was a great *Mimamsa* scholar; when he was defeated by Samkara, he decided to become the pupil of Samkaracharya. Prof. Hiriyantha, however, is not in favour of identifying Suresvara with Mandana. According to him, Mandana was the author of *Brahmasiddhi*, but nowhere in the available texts relating to Suresvara, he was ever spoken of as the author of the said text. In his philosophical outlook also Suresvara differed fundamentally from Mandana and so in the opinion of Prof. Hiriyantha, he should not be identified with Mandana Misra.

Some Aspects of his Philosophy

In the advaita vedanta, we come across three important views regarding the relation between Brahman and the individual soul : 1. *Pratibimbavada* : 2. *Abhasavada* : 3. *Avacchedavada*.

Suresvara was an upholder of *abhasavada*. According to this view, *jiva* is a semblance (*abhasa*) of Brahman. Just as the *abhasa* of the face is different from the face and is false, in the same way, the semblance self (*cidabhasa*) is different from Brahman and is false. The *jiva* is a mere appearance of Brahman in the *antahkarana*. Since there are many *antahkaranas*, there are many *cidabhasas* (semblance selves) and so there are many *jivas*. This semblance self is different from Pure Conscious-

ness and is false. *Jiva* undergoes pleasures and pains according to his own actions and so *Jiva* can never be regarded as non-different from Pure Immutable consciousness. Just as pleasures, pains and their enjoyment are false, in the same manner the semblance-enjoyers too are false. So, there can be no liberation unless the *cidabhasa* is negated. Just as the form of a man (*purusa-svarupa*) is realised only when the pillar-knowledge or *sthanu buddhi* is completely destroyed by *purusa-buddhi*, in the same manner the nature of Brahman is realised when *jiva-buddhi* is completely negated by Brahma-awareness. The *samana-dhikarana* (apposition) between the *jiva* and *Brahman* is through sublation and not through identification.

The *abhasa* of *cit* in the *jada* (unconscious) principle cannot, however, be confirmed by logical arguments; but this is to be suggested as otherwise the apparently intelligent actions of the unconscious principle cannot be explained. The *antahkarana* though unconscious, is yet acting in the manner of a conscious principle. So, to explain this apparently conscious activities of the internal organ, we have got to suppose the *abhasa* of *cit* through it. This view of the *advaita* has a close resemblance to *samkhya* because the latter also believes in the *cetanavista* (permeated with consciousness) condition of the *buddhi*. *Purusa*, however, does not undergo any change due to such *avesa*. The intelligised *buddhi* acts in the manner of a conscious principle. Of course, according to Suresvara, internal organs, external sense organs etc are false, but according to *samkhya*, *buddhi*, *ahamkara* etc. which catch the reflection of consciousness are all real.

In his philosophy, Suresvara has contended that emancipation cannot be obtained through performance of actions. It is the true knowledge revealed through *Vedanta Vakya* which alone possesses the power of destroying ignorance completely : but action which is not opposed to ignorance cannot destroy it. Action thrives on ignorance and then blossoms into innumerable petals (in the forms of *dharma* *adharma* etc) which result in bondage and pain. Liberation is not anything which is

produced; it is the same thing as destruction of ignorance and ignorance is destroyed only by knowledge. Daily and occasional duties only help the agent to purify his intellect and it is with this end in view that the aspirant is advised to perform his daily and occasional duties. (Naiskarmya siddhi 1. 50). Performance of daily duties results in the generation of merit; merit removes vices, and thereby the intellect is purified. Purified intellect then reveals the real painful nature of the world to the aspirant which in its turn produces detachment to worldly objects. Then the aspirant becomes extremely eager for liberation and follows the path of knowledge. Thus, action is only an indirect means (upaya by parampara). In fact, there is an antagonism between knowledge and action. Knowledge negates action. Just as a lamb cannot live in the company of a lion, in the same manner, knowledge and action cannot remain together in the same locus. So, knowledge must not be combined with the performance of duties i. e. no jnana karma samuccaya. Since true knowledge and liberation are one and the same thing, it does not require the performance of the *nityanaimittika* actions.

The view which Suresvara has tried to refute so vehemently in *Naiskarmyasiddhi* is *jnana karma samuccayavada* of which Bhattiprapanca was an adherent. According to Bhatti the ultimate reality is both one and many. Dvaita is real, and so action which is based on *dvaita* feeling is also real. So, the *pramanya* of *karmakanda* must be admitted. There is, therefore, joint necessity for knowledge and action. But the *samkhya* philosophy which is dualistic is not in favour of the theory of *jnana karma samuccayavada*. According to *Pravacana bhasya* there can never be a synthesis of action and knowledge just as dream objects and objects of waking experience can never be combined to serve any purpose of life. Suresvara, however, has refuted this theory mainly on two grounds :

- A. The conception of Reality as being both one and many is self-contradictory.
- B. When oneness is realised and the otherness is removed by knowledge, there can be no duties to be performed.

We should remember that action which has been referred to in the *Naiskarmyasiddhi* by Suresvara does not include *niskama karma*. If we go through the texts carefully, we shall find that by action, he has really meant only the actions prescribed in the *Mimamsa* and which are all based on the feeling of duality. The different adherents of *jnana-karma samuccayavada* have interpreted actions in the sense of *Vaidika* duties which pre-suppose a feeling of difference between the agent and action. *Niskama karma* which becomes possible only when the ego-sense is removed, does not pre-suppose duality. Hence, it is proper to say that even in the opinion of Suresvara, self-less action can be synthesised with knowledge and that there is no antagonism between the two. When Suresvara describes the relation between knowledge and action as one of opposition, he really considers actions which are done with a sense of duality and which also bring about pleasures and happiness of this world or of heaven : but when the feeling of *sva* is absolutely destroyed, action is wholly spiritualised. To link one's life with the life of divinity is not only to lose one's existence as an individual but also to regain one's reality as egoless pure consciousness. In fact, when an individual has made himself totally free from the sense of agency, he does nothing even he keeps himself engaged in disinterested social service. The freed soul works for the guidance of men who are still steeped in ignorance. He is the doer of work and is yet not the doer because he has no sense of "I" and "mine". Disinterested service is the outer side of spirituality and knowledge is the inner side. The performance of actions in a disinterested manner is linked up with social consciousness which in turn produces the feeling of universal brotherhood. Hence, selfless service cannot be decried. Suresvara's main concern was to attack the *karmakanda* so as to refute the theory of *jnanakarma samuccay* and this he had done in his *Naiskarmya siddhi* with great success. Indeed the performance of action based on the experience of duality and difference can never be synthesised with the *advaita*-realisation.

SPIRITUALITY AND HUMAN LIFE

(This article is the summary of a speech which Dr. Anima Sen Gupta gave at the death anniversary of Mme Blavatsky held at the Theosophical Society, Patna. She says : 'The theosophists do not preach any doctrine which is foreign or unintelligible to us. The doctrine of universal love, altruism, disinterested actions, re-incarnations, karma etc. are the flowers and fruits of the tree of Indian philosophy and religion. When we go through the teachings of Mme Blavatsky, we find she loses her foreign heritage and stand before us as a perfected personality of Indian soil and Indian culture.

—Editor)

In the present age of science and technology, the word "spirituality" is often misunderstood and misinterpreted. The word spiritual, the common Sanskrit equivalent of which is 'adhyatmika' refers really to that which is internal to the person. The 'atman' the life essence, the mind etc. are all internal and so everything pertaining to any one of them may, in a wide sense, be regarded as 'adhyatmika' or spiritual: the concept of spiritual is central to the cultural heritage of India.

In Indian philosophy; however, the word spiritual is not used to mean the mental or the physical: on the contrary, it refers to supramental consciousness which is the innermost core of a human being. The true spirit is the whole or the full reality which is called 'purusa' or 'atman' or 'Brahman' in the Upanisads. This trans-psychical, pure, immutable and self-revealing soul or spirit is not a mere dogma propagated through the Indian scriptures. This has been firmly established on the strength of evidence gathered from the intuitive realisation of the 'yogins' and men of wisdom and also on the basis of 'yukti' or rational argumentation.

The consciousness that constitutes the innermost self of man is thus the only thing spiritual, because it is the spark of

reflection or mode of that Great Spirit which forms the transcendental background of all appearances.

Spiritual movement, then, according to Indian tradition, is the movement of Life and Nature towards that Great 'Atman' which is the soul of all. Indian philosophy, therefore, believes in the evolution of the human soul from ignorance to knowledge, from an inert condition of existence to a fully illuminated state and this spiritual evolution needs re-incarnation times without number.

The true human life is the life of the spirit. The shell of flesh and blood is only an artificial covering of man : it is because of this artificial shell, born of ignorance, that the individual soul appears as a worldly being in a pitiable condition and goes through a process of birth and death. This is the natural life of a man from which the soul is to be dissociated. The spiritual life, which is the life immortal, does not, however, supersede the natural life immediately as if by magic. This regeneration needs spiritual culture which finally culminates in knowledge of truth and real being of man. The unveiling of the immortal man, the birth of the spiritual from the psycho-physical is the true purpose of human life and this purpose is to be fulfilled through continuous moral efforts in all spheres of life and existence. Such are the teachings of the upanisads.

Teachings of Mme Blavatsky

Like an upanisadic sage, Mme Blavatsky, too, has believed in the evolution of human life from ignorance to knowledge. She has, therefore, laid stress on the uprooting of ignorance which hides self from our vision. The discovery of the self, she asserted, is the real purpose of human evolution. In the teachings of Blavatsky, we find the echo of the upanisadic call 'atmanam viddhi' or 'know thyself'.

The belief in the oneness of the ultimate reality brings the teachings of the theosophists close to the teachings of the 'vedas' and the 'upanisads'. A verse of the Rig veda declares :

"There is only one Reality but the wise men call it by many names."

A text of the 'Atharva Veda' proclaims:

"He is the One, the One alone,
In Him all Deities become One alone."

The Sveta upanishad declares:

"Rudra is the only Lord. They do not maintain another God. He rules the worlds by means of his powers, or "There is only one God : He resides in all: He is all-pervading and He is the innermost soul of all."

The theosophist too proclaims:

"The whole phenomenon of manifestation is only a play of the Absolute. Using His chit shakti in cosmic Ideation, He manifests through the universe." Now, the absolute of Theosophy is also of the nature of Consciousness. Self or consciousness, therefore, is the root reality. This is spiritualism.

There is a wrong impression about spiritualism even among the intellectuals of our country. It is held that a spiritualistic philosophy is nothing but a life negating philosophy; and as such, it is capable of producing only a race of half-naked Fakirs or half-starved ascetics. It is, therefore, a thing to be despised by all means.

If we go deeply into the spirit of Indian culture, we shall find that this impression is not correct. A true spiritualistic philosophy never neglects the positive background of human life. As a matter of fact, ancient Indian thinkers have tried to impress upon the people the usefulness of the educational system, social ethics and good political organisation, through which human beings can reach the highest goal; i. e. the discovery of the self or the realization of the self. The life divine is being continuously displayed through the positive, the secular and the material. So, the positive, the secular and the material can never be sacrificed for the quest of the life beyond. What Indian sages have been trying to say is to bring about a synthesis between the worldly and the other worldly, between metaphysics and social science.

Moral Values

The human life appears in a particular environment and it has to become related to other embodied souls for the satisfaction of its various psycho-physical needs. The social life of individuals is built on the basis of these relations. In a spiritualistic social system, these relations are grounded on such moral principles as Truth, Equality, Non-violence, Love, Forgiveness, Self-control and Self-sacrifice. This is because spiritual enlightenment can never be obtained without moral discipline.

The moral values should constitute the foundation-stone of the social life because these are the values which are closely inter-linked with the spiritual value which is Peace or self-realisation. It is only the pure mind that can discover the self and the purity of the mind can be attained by the acquisition of moral virtues. Cultivation of moral virtues is possible only in a well organised society where relations between man and man are coherent and harmonious. How can we, then, ignore or despise the social life of man ?

The Ramayan, for example, gives us a nice picture of a well-regulated social life based on moral and spiritual principles. Here, Valmiki, the great sage, has beautifully idealised the different kinds of social relations which exist between man and man and as members of a social unit. In this epic, we see the picture of the ideal king, the ideal son, the ideal brother, the ideal wife and the ideal servant. This is an evidence to prove that according to Indian spiritualism, every day life of a man in the society should never be ignored. On the other hand, the human life, in a society should be so regulated that in and through the ordinary vibrations of the empirical life, a preparation for testing the bliss of the Life divine is continuously carried on.

Mahabharata

In the Mahabharata also, we find that same humanitarian outlook on human life emanating from a firm faith is spiritualism. Here also, we find that the social ideal is to awaken in man all human excellences which will make him fit for the realisation of his true being as ātman.

The attainment of self-realisation according to our scriptures, is quite compatible with the virtuous life led in this world. There is no need at all for giving up of all connections with social life and social activities. The Mahabharata has laid great stress on Truthfulness, self-sacrifice, honesty, straightforwardness, knowledge, contentment, love, mercy etc.

Enjoyment as material happiness should always be coupled with a spirit of self-sacrifice. The spiritualistic thinkers of India do not preach the philosophy of world negation. On the other hand, they teach us the right way of living the worldly life; the glory of human life consists solely in the renunciation of the selfish motive. If enjoyment is sought for the sake of selfish satisfaction only, then this form of enjoyment will produce nothing but greed, hatred and 'himsa' which always act as forces of disruption in an organised human life.

We do find such a humanitarian outlook in the teachings of the theosophists as well. They too think that it is the duty of a man to work for the welfare of others in a disinterested manner. Mme Blavatsky has proclaimed: "Giving to others, more than to oneself" is self-sacrifice and such self-sacrifice should constitute the guiding principle of life of a theosophist. Egocentric desires are not to be cultivated and one should always be prepared to work for the welfare of the world. Since there is only one Reality and the individuals are merely centres of consciousness in that Reality, there is no real difference between individual and individual. All life is one. It is the one Reality which is manifesting itself through thousands of forms. Like the Vedanta philosophy, the theosophy also preaches the doctrine of universal love, self-sacrifice, just dealings with all fellowmen etc. "Live for other" is the motto of a theosophist just as it is the motto of true followers of the ancient Indian tradition.

Spiritualistic System

From what we have discussed it is clear that spiritualism is in no way antagonistic to the healthy development of human life. On the other hand, in its unfalsified form, spiritualism is

the strongest support of morality and is the most efficient moulder of life and society. Spiritualism never preaches anti-materialism; but it does not assert that material happiness and comforts, which are no doubt necessary, are not the highest values of life. The highest value lies in the discovery of the self which is the essential being of man. Life begins in a material world and the material world does charm a man, nourish him and provide him with all the material necessities of life.

The self, itself, remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give such importance as is its legitimate due. But man has got to discover his inner essence which is of the nature of the spirit. The discovery or the realisation of this spirit constitutes the highest goal of human life. It is a case of transcendence and not of antagonism between spiritualism and materialism.

As one ascends higher in the scale of spirituality, his material happiness gets transformed into the happiness of the spirit. At the ordinary stage, the happiness of the soul remains mixed up with the happiness of the world and in that stage, the happiness of the world gets prominence. This is the natural law of worldly life. A spiritualistic system does not give an independent significance to the material principle. Materiality always derives its significance from spirituality with which it remains in association. It is the spiritual which is of the highest value; so even in the case of material enjoyment and worldly action, an adherence to spirituality must be prominent. This is spiritual culture.

Spiritualism never teaches that man must be poor and hungry in order to be spiritual. Attention to the needs or desires of the physical body never disqualifies a person for spirituality. A spiritualistic philosophy only teaches that man should not regard material happiness as the ultimate goal of life and should not, therefore, get too much attached to material pleasures emotionally because in that case he will be psychologically incapable of giving his best attention to the spirit which is his real essence. One who can realise that self

alone is of supreme value will become naturally indifferent to material things which has got only an instrumental value for him. Spiritual culture in india is based mainly on the virtue of 'aparigraha' which means a dispassionate attitude towards material prosperity through the perception of its being tainted by cruelty, injustice and other defects. Referring to 'aparigraha' Swami Vivekananda has said: "In the west, they are trying to solve the problem of how much a man can possess and we are trying to solve the problem on how little a man can live."

Lastly, I would like to stress the points that the theosophists do not preach any doctrine which is foreign or unintelligible to us. The doctrine of universal love, altruism, disinterested actions, reincarnations, Karma etc. are the flowers and fruits of the tree of Indian philosophy and religion. There may be difference here and there in the interpretations of these theories from the point of view of a theosophist; even then when we go through the teachings of Mme Blavatsky, we find she loses her foreign heritage and stands before us as a perfected personality of Indian soil and Indian culture.

THEOSOPHY & ANCIENT INDIAN WISDOM

The theosophists have explained that the basic principle of theosophy is the ideal of brotherhood of Man. Reality is one and the individuals are merely so many centres of consciousness in that One Reality. We are all one life. There is only one God who resides in all. It is the One Reality which is manifesting itself through innumerable forms. There is, therefore, no real difference between Man and Man. The differences which we notice in worldly life, are artificial and false.

Like the advaita philosophy, the theosophy also preaches the doctrine of oneness of all as the ultimate truth of life. The rich and the poor, the educated and the ignorant, the high and the low, are all rooted in the same manner in the Life Eternal. All are, therefore, bound together by the sacred thread of fraternity; all men have a common end to realise, a common purpose to achieve by mutual help and mutual sympathy. The common end is the spiritual regeneration or the revelation of the essence of man. Man has got to evolve from ignorance to knowledge, from an inert condition of existence to a fully illuminated state. Such a spiritual evolution pre-supposes a life of spiritualised action which is nothing but the dynamic aspect of the feeling of universal love coupled with an attitude of helpfulness to other persons. The feeling of brotherhood of man finds its spontaneous expression in the desire to be of some help to others who are also the parts and parcels of one Infinite existence. When a man purifies his thought and life by selfless love and devotion to God and humanity as a whole, his action at once takes the form of a spiritual sadhana and tends to promote human progress and perfection.

Madam Blavatsky

The dedicated life of Madam Blavatsky was indeed a life of such "spiritualised action" so magnificently advocated by the sages of ancient India. It is really the deep love for life eternal that alone can melt the heart of man with the warmth of sympathy, kindness and compassion for all living beings. Disinterested service which is a cardinal principle of theosophy is, thus, the active aspect of the ideal of Brotherhood which forms the nucleus of the theosophical teaching.

Service as an Ideal

A theosophical believer is expected to worship God in his daily life with a true service for the welfare of mankind. Self-sacrifice is the theosophist's sacred oblation that he offers unto God; Madam Blavatsky has proclaimed: "Giving to others more than to oneself" should constitute the guiding principle of life of a Theosophist.

Ego-centric desires are not to be cultivated and one should always be ready to work for the welfare of the whole world. When a man sacrifices his own happiness for the welfare of his fellowmen, he actually pours out his own life into the Great Stream of life which is flowing from beginningless time without any break. It is at this moment that he realises the essential unity of life and also becomes conscious of the inherent harmony that exists between giving and receiving. According to theosophy, life-stream does not flow throughout its whole course with equal vigours and freshness ; there are some centres which are weak in energy and are, thus, in need of re-filling. It is only when all the centres are equally rich with happiness and strength that the entire life-stream can flow smoothly with immeasurable joy and inexplicable brightness. Sacrifice, therefore, is necessary as it pours out the elixir of life from the strong centres into those which are weak. Thus, the act of sacrifice is an act of delight and expansion and not of pain and loss. A theosophist pleads : " a clean mind, free from selfishness

and greed, a brotherly feeling for all, a strong sense of justice and a readiness to give" should constitute the keynote of a theosophist's life. If any member does not give expression to this ideal in his daily life, he ceases to be a theosophist.

The theosophical belief in the universal brotherhood and oneness of the Divine Life, mingled with a sincere desire to serve humanity in a selfless manner, does not appear to be either new or foreign to the believers in ancient Indian faith and religion. In fact, these are the teachings of the vedas, the upanishads, the Gita and the epics etc. The bodhisattva ideal of Buddhism too embodies a sincere belief in the disinterested service for the welfare of all sentient beings. Madam Blavatsky has rightly remarked that Hinduism and Buddhism contain profound truths and as such they deserve better treatment.

The harmony between the active worldly life and the higher life of the spirit effected through the performance of selfless social service constitutes an important trait of Indian civilization and culture. Socio-ethical values are believed to be closely interlinked with the spiritual value which is liberation. In fact liberation is nothing but the finest flowering of these socio-ethical excellences. Egoism or selfishness has always been decried by the sages of ancient India. In the Yajurveda, for example, we meet with a very positive altruistic view on human life emanating from a firm faith in spiritualism. The Sages declare: "O ye men, increase the store of goods acquired by honest and fair means to be used in the service of humanity. May your life be completely dedicated to the principle of selfless service. May the spiritually minded people also not give up this humanitarian work,"

(English trans : Devichand)

Again we hear:

"I resort to agriculture and craft for removing poverty and ministering happiness to all."

(English trans : Devichand)

The Mahabharata also lays stress on the cultivation of an altruistic frame of mind for the attainment of social prosperity as well as spiritual perfection. A well-governed and prosperous city is one in which all people are happy, virtuous free from greed and selfishness, truthful and are also mutually helpful to each other. The foremost duty of the king is to give food to those who are hungry. The king of a country should always be ready to sacrifice his personal happiness for the good of the people. He should also be responsible for developing an altruistic spirit in his people. The cardinal principle of virtue such as truthfulness, non-injury, compassion, friendliness based on the feeling of fraternity and disinterestedness in action are to be practised by all without exception because these are the principles for the well-being of the society and also for self-purification culminating in liberation.

The concept of a Bodhisattva too, is the concept of a spirit soaked in the milk of sympathy and compassion for suffering humanity. He does not seek his own highest good; on the contrary, he is ever ready to suffer for the purpose of removing sorrows of all living beings. In fact, he becomes a Buddha for the good of his suffering fellowmen. The Bodhisattva declares:—

“When fear and sorrow are as much undesirable to me as they are to others, then why should I work for my own perfection only and not also for the perfection of others?”

The Upanisadas, too have taught us to respect the worldly life, to honour the relations existing between man and man; to love all; to respect all to perform our duties and to live for a full hundred years by doing good deeds so that the society may prosper and produce more and more good for the benefit of all.

In the Manu Smriti, particular stress has been laid on the performance of humanitarian service, as according to it, the primary duty of the householder is to support the students, the sannyasis and the vanaprasthis who are not in a position to earn their livelihood. The householder should always be

ready to help others with cash and kind in case of emergency. When an individual performs social duties in a selfless spirit of service, it is possible for him to destroy his narrow egoism which is supposed to be the most powerful knot of our bound-life. Indeed, a sense of duty carries with it a sincere desire to serve others. Man cannot realise his oneness with all, unless his narrow ego-sense is completely swept away by the ever-rising waves of altruism.

Glory of Renunciation

To repeat : the sages of ancient India have proclaimed again and again the glory of renunciation of the selfish motive without which no spiritual progress is possible. In the family life as well as in the life of the society, enjoyment should always be sought with selflessness, sacrifice and detachment. It is the beauty and bliss of God which is to be enjoyed by us in and through all relations which exist between man and man.

In the Bhagavadgita, Arjuna was asked by the Lord Himself to work disinterestedly for social good and social welfare. It is the duty of the enlightened soul to work for the good of mankind. The attitude of service and the feeling of affinity with all constitute the most effective means by which a man can fight and conquer a purely natural life and fulfil his mission of spiritual perfection. "Live for others and not merely for your own self," is really the motto of a karma-yogi, because he sees all in himself and himself in all. A Karma-yogi has realised the fundamental nature of the self as different from the body; he looks upon his own self as of the same nature as other selves. A Karmayogi is described in the Gita as "sarvabhutatmabhutatma."

For lack of space, I have made a brief survey of the ancient Indian ideal of human life and action on the empirical plane of existence; this will make it clear that from the dawn of civilisation, Indian people have felt and expressed a sincere

desire to imbibe excellent qualities of man—qualities which spring forth spontaneously from a firm faith in spiritual oneness and Brotherhood of all living beings. Life is to be lived by each one of us for a harmonious development of all; otherwise evolution of the human world will shrink considerably and there will be no scope for human progress. Whenever we act from greed and selfishness, whenever there is a conflict and maladjustment in our day-to-day life, the rhythmic progress of spiritual evolution is disturbed by undesirable jerks and consequently there is retardation in human progress and perfection.

The cardinal virtues of love, sympathy, friendliness and compassion should therefore, be practised by all with the force of conviction, so that these alone may constitute the key-note of peace and progress. In India, the search for truth primarily means a search for the moral and spiritual values of life. Moral development is an inner growth stimulated by firm faith in Divine heritage of Man. This superb faith in Divine origin flows out from the heart of an individual with such a force that it remoulds him in a newer and nobler form. The unveiling of the immortal man—the birth of the spiritual from the psycho-physical—is the true purpose of a man's life and this purpose is to be fulfilled through universal love, knowledge and disinterested service. Such are the noble teachings of ancient India.

We do hear similar echo in the teachings and writings of the Theosophists. For example, a theosophist says: "He who does not practise altruism, he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with one weaker or poorer than himself, he who neglects to help his brother-man, is no theosophist" Like a true Hindu or a true Buddhist, the theosophist, too, believes that it is *Trishna* or the selfish desire that actually binds a man to a life of disharmony and discord; "a loving selfless and helpful nature" alone can win the grace of the Great Masters of the human race. Like the sages of ancient India, the theosophists, too, believe that the limited and

non-eternal joy of life can never give man permanent peace and eternal happiness. Just as the Upanisadic sage has declared: "*Jo vai bhuma tat sukham*

Nalpe sukhamasti."

"That which is infinite is really bliss. The limited can never give us real and permanent joy." In the same manner Mrs. Besant has said: "The first cry of the soul for liberation is the result of realisation that the earth has become to him a prison and let it be decorated as it may be he pants for the free and limitless air beyond its inclosing walls." Worldly pleasures are "limited transient unsatisfying. He is tired of the changing; from very weariness, he cries out for liberty."

Indeed, the theosophists have churned the ocean of ancient Indian wisdom and have been able to discover the precious pearls embedded therein. The ancient Indian beliefs that Brahman manifests itself in flesh and that the triumph of spirit over flesh is the final truth of life, are equally shared by the theosophists. According to theosophy also, *ātmavidyā* or spiritual knowledge is the real truth and the primary duty of a man is to know his own self. As a matter of fact, both ancient Indian Philosophy and theosophy speak of one essential unity that makes one see the supreme soul in all things and all things in it; the feeling of separateness is thus destroyed and the feeling of fraternity is revived. Like the upanishads, the theosophist also says: "As rays from a sun, all spirits flame forth from the Great Mind; here is the source of their being, here the central fire whereof all are sparks."

Civilisation

Truly speaking civilisation can flourish only when a world, based on humanitarian sentiment of goodwill, brotherliness, active sympathy, finding expression in disinterested service and a strong sense of duty comes into being. Let both Theosophy and ancient Indian wisdom give us hope and inspiration to create such a world. Let us look only at the soul of man—

the real spiritual being which is of the same illuminating nature in all living beings. We must remember that the soul belongs to no nation, no society and no country. It belongs only to the Divinity. Let Immortal Spirit of Madan Blavatsky touch and purify our whole being so that we may be able to carry the message of oneness of life to all parts of the world and make the earth an abode of peace, harmony and happiness:

“Nectar blow all the winds
Nectar pour all the rivers
Nectar be the dust of the earth
Nectar be our guardian heaven.”
Om Peace, Peace, Peace.

YAJNAVALKYA—THE GREAT SAGE OF MITHILA

Just as an artist, even though highly gifted, can never paint movement without giving it an unmoving form, in the same manner, a person with a limited intellect is not in a position to catch the spirit of the thought currents of a Great Mind from a distant age. The writer is conscious of her limitations and she knows full well that she has undertaken the difficult task of expressing in a brief outline, some of the soul inspiring ideas of Yajnavalkya, the great sage of Mithila. A brief-sketch, based on scanty materials, available, from the extant sources, will, however, be helpful to understand the highly enlightened mind of the sage.

Yajnavalkya—a man of versatile genius

Yajnavalkya, the great sage of the Brihadaranyaka upaniṣad was an inhabitant of Mithila. He probably belonged to the 7th century B. C. and during that period, Magadh was not organised like Mithila. At that time, the philosophical field was dominated exclusively by Yajnavalkya. He was the spiritual teacher of Janaka, the king of Mithila. From what has been stated in the Brihadaranyaka Upaniṣad and the Mahabhārata, we can very well affirm that Mithila was an important centre of the spiritual culture of India in that far off age. Janaka and Yajnavalkya were the two shining stars of Mithila and two luminous personalities were bright enough to illumine the whole of India.

Yajnavalkya was a man of versatile genius. His interests were manifold and knowledge was also deep and profound. He made notable contribution to religion, morality, metaphysics and social philosophy. He composed Satapatha Brahmaná. The whole of Yajurveda is proclaimed to be promulgated by him. His knowledge of Samkhya-Yoga was thorough and wide. He was the master of the knowledge of Brahman and was also a noted scholar of the purāṇas. He so declared

in the Mahabharata while giving spiritual instructions to a King. (Tathaiva Romaharsena purāṇamava dhāritam). Being the knower of Brahman, he had no fascination for the ritualistic religion of the Karma Kāṇḍa of the Veda. He declared emphatically that fulness and eternal bliss of life could be attained by the knowledge of Brahman or Atman alone. If one would make fire offerings and perform sacrifice without making efforts to acquire the knowledge of the highest and the best (i. e. Ātman or Brahman) then he could enjoy only the transitory fruits of his actions both here and hereafter. Eternal peace would elude his grasp. Like an inaccessible star on the distant horizon, it would attract him but would always remain beyond his reach.

Again, Yajnavalkya's answers to Sākalya's queries (as narrated in the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanisad) reveals that in the opinion of the great sage, the followers of Karma Kanda could reach only the region of the Death. It was the custom of the age that the sacrificer had to buy back sacrifice from the priests by paying them remuneration and hence the relation between the sacrificer and the priest was not a sacred spiritual relation. It was only a worldly relation of give and take. Yajnavalkya, on the other hand, believed that one could not taste the bliss of the Life Divine unless he was able to rise above all self-centred relations of give and take. The anti-ritualistic attitude which developed so remarkably in the teachings of Mahavira and Buddha, was, perhaps, the legacy of the liberal and profound philosophical teaching of this great sage of Mithila. Yajnavalkya also advocated the eating of the flesh of cows and oxen and his approach to life was not conservative. In the Mahabharata, we find him declaring :

“Sarve varṇā Brāhmaṇa
Brahmajaśca,
Sarve nityam Vyaharante ca
Brahma.”

All varṇas have originated from Brahman and all persons should, therefore, be treated as Brahman. All are uttering the name of Brahman and so no varṇa should be regarded as separate from Brahman. By so declaring, Yajñavalkya not only exhibited a liberal attitude to social life but had also pointed out to us the real spirit that was to be discovered at the root of the varṇa arrangement of ancient India. The soft, tender and brilliant mind of the great sage did appreciate the value of man as man and had emphatically declared that the varṇa-vibhāga should not be understood in any sense other than the sense of the allocation of duties to different classes according to their capacities. All men should be regarded as equal so far as their human nature was concerned but their intellectual capacities and practical abilities did differ. It was, therefore, to utilise the abilities of all to a maximum degree for the welfare of the society that the class-division was introduced. The division of society into four classes of people was made to further the progress of both the individual and the society. Every person was to equip himself according to the social duties allocated to him and he was also expected to devote his heart and soul to the proper discharge of his duties. Under this system, the individuals of various capacities could get equal opportunities to show their inherent powers in different spheres of life. This was indeed a harmony of multi-coloured personalities, the keynote of which was Brahman, the Life Eternal.

According to Brihadāranyaka Upaniṣad, Yajñavalkya had two wives, Maitreyi and Katyayani. Maitreyi was keen on acquiring the knowledge of the highest and the best as that alone could enable her to reach the completion of life. When Yajña Valkya was going to embrace Sannyassa, leaving his householder's life, he wanted to distribute wealth and property between his two wives. At that time, a fine discussion on Self-love and Self-knowledge was held between the husband and the wife and even today, this discussion is regarded as a crest jewel of Indian Spiritual Culture.

The keynote of this discussion is that wealth and property can enrich a man only outwardly; these cannot purify the inner personality of man. So long as a man remains interested only in the material gains, he moves in the material world of give and take, receiving and rejection and cannot come out of this prison-house to bathe in the soft and ever-refreshing Light of the Atman. He cannot get at the complete personality which is a level of pure awareness, a level of joy.

The enlightened personality of Maitreyi was not at all satisfied merely with living in ignorance and thinking only of the material gain and loss of this world. She had a desire for truth, for good, for beauty and also for the spiritual fulfilment of life. She was eager to reach the level of value-awareness after rejecting all needs and demands of the narrow life of the empirical existence. She knew that her husband was a highly enlightened personality who had reached the highest level of life. He had gained a perspective of new values which were far nobler than the biological and social values of life. So, the wife, being drawn by her intense desire for good, wanted to know from her wise husband the true path by following which she would be able to blossom and hold herself upwards like a sun-flower with a view to bathing her own personality with the nectar of immortality. Yajnavalkya, then, discussed with her the nature of that immortal spiritual essence in man by tasting which an individual could become immortal and could get immersed in the Great Delight. The precious words which were uttered by Maitreyi when she had been informed about her husband's intention to divide property between his two wives, were the finest expressions of a dispassionate spiritual mind which was keen to know the mystery and values of the various aspects of human existence. Maitreyi asked, "Lord, if this whole earth with all its treasure be mine, shall I be able to attain immortality through them?" Yajna Valkya replied in the negative. "Earthly riches", said he, "were to be looked upon as means to earthly happiness only. The deeds which one could do with wealth could never lead one to Immortality." On hearing this,

Maitreyi replied, "What should I do with wealth and property then, if these cannot raise me above the mortal life of the earth?" Thus, she refused to accept the material gift from her husband as these would not enable her to get submerged in the unique thrill of Delight and Immortality. The wife was, thus, truly equal to her husband in purity and detachment. She could feel the presence of the Great Uniting thread of the world in the inner glow of her heart. The path that Yajna Valkya then explained to his wife was also the sweetest and the finest one that a human being could ever follow to reach the apex of his life. Yajna Valkya declared "A husband is dear to the wife not for the sake of the husband, a wife is dear not for the sake of wife, a son is dear not for the sake of the son, wealth is dear not for the love of wealth; all these are dear for the love of the self."

The significance of these words is that we do not love anything or being of the world for its own sake but we love them for the sake of the Ātman which is the Delight itself. In other words, the Ātman is the real fountain of joy and love and whatever joy or delight of finite life, we experience in our various loving relations with beings and things of the world, is the pouring out of that Infinite Delight through the earthly mediums. Wife, husband and sons are truly the occasions when Delight that exists in the inmost core of a man's heart in the form of his self, begins to grow in purity and expansiveness, depending on all relations of the finite human existence. So, we should not allow ourselves to be swallowed completely by the outside world. We should always try to discover the self in the inner vision of our heart. Hence Yajna Valkya instructed Maitreyi by saying "The self, my dear Maitreyi, should verily be realised; should be heard of, reflected on and meditated upon." Without pinning one's faith completely in the Delight of the Great Ātman, one will never be able to attain immortality. The entire creation is the manifestation of the Great Ātman and being so, the world has become the abode of immeasurable delight that flows into the heart of man through manifold relations of the organic and the inorganic worlds. The centri-

fugal principle of the entire creation is atman, the bliss and therefore, the atman should be the true object to be known and adored by man. One should not think that living beings and non-living things of the world are different from the Atman. They are neither independent nor complete by themselves. If a man fails to have a vision of the uniting thread that runs through life and the universe, he will not be able to assess the value of the world properly and will run madly after things of the world with an intense longing for their possession. In that case, he will lead the life of a self-centred and small person driven far away from the truth and pure joy of life and will be cooked undeliciously in his impure juice, losing for ever the vision of immortality. To make this point clear, the great sage declared emphatically : "This Brahman, this Ksatriya, these worlds, these gods, these vedas, these beings and these all are only the self." It is the self that is immortal and to realise the self as the inner essence of one's being after withdrawing the mind from the transitory objects of the world, is to realise immortality. Just as one can grasp the particular notes of a drum only by grasping the general note due to which the particular notes are melodious, in the same way, one cannot enjoy the particular pleasures of life in the forms of wife, sons, riches etc. without discovering their perennial source which is the Delight of Atman. These immortal words which once issued forth from the mouth of the great sage of Mithi'a are still serving as the living and the most inspiring message of India to the outside world.

The underlying meaning of Yajna Valkya's teachings is that all sweet and soft emotions which a man feels through his different relations with the things of the world emanate from the blissful nature of the Atman; plants and trees, flowers and foliage, rivers and hills are all permeated by the Delight of the Atman and the sweet and refreshing joy which these natural phenomena scatter, are the finite expressions of that JOY Eternal. If a person can feel intensely this underlying prin-

ciple of unity and can receive this wonderful message of the oneness of Life and Light running through the different levels of existence, then he can easily rise above the narrow selfishness of individual existence and can melt himself into the sweetness of a disinterested universal love which possesses the potency of embracing the whole of the creation. It is by knowing the entire creation as being permeated constantly by the Delight of the Atman that one can realise his relation with others on a universal level and can expand his own existence to embrace the existence of all. He then becomes free from all passions of the heart and becomes a symbol of Immortal Love and Light.

CONCLUSION

While paying our respectful homage to the illustrious son of Mithila, we can say, without exaggeration that it is Yajna Valkya who has raised human love to a higher level by linking it with the Delight of the Atman. It is through the emotion of love that one can feel the expansion of self by identifying all loveable objects of the world with his own self and, thereby, becoming aware of a bigger existence that also opens up a wider perspective of his own being. He has eulogised the love between husband and wife by declaring that when husband and wife lose themselves in love, then each of them is aware of nothing else but a single existence, saturated through and through with joy and happiness. It is only the deep experience of love that can unfold a new dimension of truth in the form of oneness of life. Yajna Valkya declared, thus, while explaining the identity between the supreme soul and the individual soul, "As a man fully embraced by his dear wife, knows nothing external or internal, even so this individual self, fully embraced by the supreme self, knows nothing external or internal." Sincere and pure love is a uniting force and this force, if used softly, tenderly and in a pure manner, is sure to lead to the

blossoming of ourselves as manifestations of the Great Atman; because the soul, being both cit and ananda, can grow in knowledge as well as in emotion of Love. Love starts with a feeling of duality between the lover and the beloved but when it grows deep and intense, the lover finds his beloved in the innermost core of the heart as completely related to him and feels oneness with her. One enters, as it were, inside the other and there is nothing but a single awareness, a single experience, a single feeling of Joy and Delight. The efficacy of love to raise man to a higher level of existence when felt as an expression of bliss of the self (as advocated by Yajna Valkya) has added sanctity to family life which is an important limb of the social life. The Satapatha Brahmana which has been composed by him, has praised householder's life by declaring that society can maintain its own stability only when house-holders succeed in building up happy and healthy homes. In his opinion, the family life and the social life of man should be linked with the Life Eternal. That he valued the material things as well which, in his opinion, could make a man's life in the society happy and prosperous is clear from the question which King Janaka had put to him when he entered into the King's Court on a particular occasion (as narrated in the Brihadaranyaka Upanisad). The passage runs as under:—

“Janaka, Emperor of Videha, took his seat to give audience when Yajna Valkya arrived. The emperor said to him “With what object have you come ? Desiring cattle or some subtle questions for discussion.” “Both indeed, O Emperor.” said he, (ubhayameva). So long as one has not embraced the life of renunciation, he desires every thing which is necessary for a healthy and fruitful social life. The sage himself proceeded on his life journey. Step by step and even at the time of departing for the forest life, he thought of his two wives and tried to make provisions for their fruitful earthly existence. Even in one's efforts for Brahma-realisation, he seemed to be in favour


of moderation. In his opinion, austerity should not be practised with such rigidity as would lead to death.

The most brilliant colour that the sage of Mithila has added to the varied tradition of Indian culture is undoubtedly the linking of the best of our empirical life with the life eternal. The life on earth becomes noble only when it is saturated through and through with the sweetness and freshness of deep and disinterested love. Yajna Valkya has taught us how the different forms of love of our empirical life such as conjugal love, the love of children, wealth, cattle etc. can be ennobled and sacrificed by experiencing them as expressions of the love of the Self. It is only in this way that we can advance from our empirical life to the life of Light and Knowledge without feeling any contempt for the worldly objects. Our journey to the apex of life is a journey from the finite expressions of Light to the Light itself. The unity with all creatures, when realised through knowledge and love, gives us a very delightful and all pervasive concept of existence. The various forms of joy that start from a man's ownself in relation to persons and things of the world, are to be regarded as having its ever-expanding source in the Delight of the Atman. At such a wonderful moment of a wide and expansive existence a man finds that these refreshing forms of experience are leading him to the apex of life wherefrom by looking down he can find nothing that is dark, nothing that is ignoble, nothing that is sorrowful or fragile. Everything partakes of the nature of Light and Love. He has plunged himself, as it were, into the very source of Light in which he has lost his separate existence. That love is ever cheerful and has the power of making every item of the world cheerful, when directed with a proper perspective of the love of Self, is the immortal song that Mithila has contributed to the multiple musical notes of ancient India. Self is immortal and self is Delight, Truth and Beauty. Truth comes through the path of Beauty and Delight and Beauty and Delight again find expression through Truth. India can never forget Maitreyi,

the wonderful female scholar of Mithila whose intense eagerness for the attainment of immortality will always cast a refreshing influence on the cultural life of our country; nor can India put out of her mind the image of Yajna Valkya who has declared beautifully that pure and disinterested love, rooted in the love of the Atman, can lead to the blossoming of a man's life even though the object of his love is a worldly one.



Indira Gandhi National
Centre for the Arts



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Anima Sen Gupta is now Head of the Dept. of Philosophy, Patna College. She has been contributing regularly articles on different aspects of Indian philosophy in Indian as well as foreign journals. She has tackled the formidable task of writing several valuable books on Sāṃkhya philosophy, namely "The Evolution of Sāṃkhya School of Thought" : "Chandogya Upanishad : Sāṃkhya Point of View" : "Katho Upanishad : Sāṃkhya Point of View" : "Classical Sāṃkhya : a Critical Study" : and "Sāṃkhya and Advaita Vedanta : a Comparative Study." These books, produced for the first time, were hailed by scholars as a brilliant study of the Samkhya system.

Her comprehensive work "A Critical Study of the Philosophy of Ramanuja" has been well appreciated by the scholarly world in India and abroad.

All the essays in the present work are brilliantly written, each maintaining an original line of approach, and also shedding a new light on some of the riddles of philosophy.

Those interested in Indian philosophy will find the "enlarged edition" most satisfying and rewarding. The Universities and Degree colleges in India will do well to take advantage of this valuable publication so that post-graduate students in Indian philosophy may acquire a better knowledge and understanding of the riddles of Indian philosophy.

15th August, 1977

M. R. S.

Publisher